

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AIRLINE SAFETY INSPECTORS
SHOULD BE RESTORED

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, last November 10, after an extensive investigation, the Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on the Reagan administration's cutbacks in the FAA's airline safety inspector workforce. These inspectors are the vanguard of the Federal Government's responsibility to insure that the Nation's airlines are complying with the Federal aviation safety regulations. These cuts cause the Subcommittee on Aviation a great deal of concern because they come at a time when many new carriers are starting up operations, when more established carriers are providing new types of service and shifting services to new locations, and when economic conditions are forcing the airline industry to examine any and all means to reduce costs.

Presently, the Nation's airline system is very safe and it has been getting safer, but I am concerned that these cuts in the inspectors will result in too little FAA presence in the airlines' cockpits, training facilities, and maintenance bases which could lead to a reversal of these trends.

In this session, I will be working through the appropriations process to restore the number of field inspectors to previous levels. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to insure that there is no diminution of safety inspection and surveillance of the Nation's airlines.

For the Members' further information, I am including in these remarks the text of a letter I have sent to Secretary Dole on this matter, as well as the text of a speech recently delivered by National Transportation Safety Board member Donald D. Engen to the National Aviation Club of Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
AND TRANSPORTATION,

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 18, 1983.

HON. ELIZABETH DOLE,
Secretary of Transportation, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY DOLE: On Thursday, November 10, the Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on the reductions in the FAA's air carrier safety inspector staff. The Subcommittee is concerned that the reductions could have long-term implications for the Safety of the nation's airline industry. Comparing FY 1981 with FY 1983 there was

a 16% reduction in the number of authorized field inspectors (638 and 534 respectively), and another 7% reduction is expected in the current fiscal year, for a total cut of approximately 23%.

What gives me concern about these reductions is that they are coming at a time when the FAA's responsibilities for air carrier inspection have expanded. Airline deregulation has spawned numerous new carriers and has resulted in the more established carriers realigning their operations both geographically and in the type of service provided. These developments have substantially increased the workload placed on FAA's field inspectors. Also, general economic trends are forcing the airline industry to examine any and all means to reduce costs. FAA's responsibility for ensuring that cost cutting does not have an impact on the safety of operations is most certainly increasing. Since neither the effects of deregulation nor the general economic climate are static, I believe those responsibilities and workload will continue to expand.

In the hearing, FAA Administrator Helms talked about a number of management and program initiatives aimed at increases in inspector productivity. Though I still have questions about some of these initiatives, I applaud Administrator Helms for his efforts to recoup in productivity increases what has been lost in staff. My concern is first of all that, while most of the staff cuts have already been made, most of the productivity enhancements will be implemented at some point in the future, and secondly, that when the productivity enhancements are realized, there is no assurance that we will even return to earlier capabilities, much less exceed them.

My view is that FAA's safety surveillance and enforcement capabilities need to be expanded beyond what they have been in the past to meet increasing workloads. Increases in productivity will be an integral part of any effort in this area, but it is my belief that there simply is no substitute for sustaining, rather than reducing, air carrier inspector staff in the field. Without a restoration of safety inspector staff, I believe FAA will be stretched too thin to carry out its responsibilities.

The airline industry is the safest mode of transportation, and since deregulation, it has been getting safer. My concern is that these cutbacks are the initial steps of loosening up of safety regulation of the airlines. Fewer inspectors translate into less FAA presence in the airline's day-to-day operations and into less of a sense among airline management and employees that someone is watching what they are doing. This may create on the part of some carriers a more lax compliance attitude that, in the long run, could reverse the excellent safety record that currently exists.

Everyone agrees that, while most of the economic decisionmaking in the airline industry has been deregulated, safety has not been deregulated and should not be deregulated. Both the public safety and the public confidence in this industry require a firm belief that FAA's regulation of airline safety ensures irreducible safety require-

ments which no airline can short-cut. The recent significant reductions in the FAA safety inspector workforce and in the FAA's regulatory "presence" in airline operations convey exactly the wrong message to the airlines and to the traveling public.

I recommend that the air carrier inspector workforce be returned to the FY 1981 authorized level. This would represent an increase of approximately 100 positions from present levels. I believe that such action, coupled with at least some of the FAA's proposed management and program initiatives, will enable FAA to carry out its important responsibilities to the extent expected by the traveling public and the airline industry.

Again, thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

NORMAN Y. MINETA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Aviation.

REMARKS BY DONALD D. ENGEN

Good afternoon . . .

I'd like to take just a moment to thank the National Aviation Club for its invitation to speak . . . and to thank all of you for what I once heard a speaker describe as "a wonderful reception—which I so richly deserve but so seldom get."

Seriously there is nothing more complicated in my gratitude than the simple fact that I like to be with people who are in aviation. Over the last 40 years, I've spent my career either flying airplanes . . . testing airplanes . . . manufacturing airplanes or establishing policy about airplanes . . . and it has been both enjoyable and a superb education.

The enjoyment came from doing those things that dreams are made of, and the education from the fact that I've never met any two people in aviation who could agree on anything.

I sometimes suspect that the record would show we have argued about everything from the center of gravity on the Wright Flyer to the rate of climb on Scott Crossfield's X-15.

But no matter how heated our discussions, no one has ever lost sight of the fact that the final decision should be based on only one criterion: that it was good for aviation!

I believe this freedom of thought . . . this internal watchfulness . . . has been a healthy thing for aviation. It has acted as a kind of catalyst that has helped produce what we have today—a safe, technically sophisticated aviation system.

We are now in the midst of another one of those legitimate, and necessary "soul searchings" in aviation. This time the argument centers around the entire airline industry. The industry is where it has been many times in the past—in a state of flux.

Many long-established airlines have vacated some of their territories, and many new, often smaller airlines have moved to fill the gap.

To be more specific, in 1978—the year the Airline Deregulation Act was implemented—there were 219 air carrier and commuter airlines in scheduled service. In 1983, the total had risen to 419.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

This kind of dramatic growth has brought with it both economic uncertainties and questions about the impact of growth on safety. What does it mean in terms of airline maintenance . . . operations . . . training . . . and FAA surveillance?

Could cost-cutting triggered by increased competition impact on maintenance or operations expenditures? Will the new generation of aviation management have the same commitment to safety excellence as did the old?

The questioners themselves are not the uninitiated—rather, they range over the entire spectrum of the aviation community—airline management and union officials . . . Congressmen . . . the media . . . the sophisticated air traveler.

The National Transportation Safety Board might turn them all aside with a technically correct answer which would be this:

Congress did not deregulate air safety—the same Federal Air Regulations—and more—that existed before deregulation exist today. Nor is there any data base that shows a decay in aviation safety since deregulation.

In fact, one key indicator—the Board's own accident rate statistics—shows just the opposite—that the accident rates for small as well as large airlines have improved significantly between 1978 and 1983. In the fatal accident rate category alone, reductions run as high as 45 percent.

Part 135 commuters are doing even better. For the same period, their total accident rate for every 100,000 departures was down by three quarters. Their fatal accident rate dropped by 87 percent.

Isn't this proof enough that deregulation has not spawned safety problems?

The answer to that question is "no." Statistics are wonderful, but at the Safety Board we have been raised on the cross check . . . and as the political pollsters like to say the results of these cross checks are still "out."

That is not to say we expect to find a problem. What it means is that the Safety Board is doing what our Congressional mandate tells us to do—to be alert to any possible safety threat . . . to constantly probe until we are fully satisfied that the air traveler faces not even a hint of a safety hazard.

For example, the Board is conducting an on-going investigation into an accident involving Air Illinois, a 13-year-old regional air carrier which, in recent years, has expanded its service to about 120 flights a day covering a six-state area.

On the night of October 11, 1983 an Air Illinois Hawker-Siddeley 748 crashed enroute from Springfield to Carbondale, Illinois, killing ten persons in what was one of only three fatal air carrier accidents in the United States during 1983.

As part of its effort to determine the cause of the tragedy, the Board held five-days of public hearings.

What were the issues? The adequacy of Air Illinois' maintenance procedures was one. The airline's operational procedures was another. And a third was the Federal Aviation Administration's surveillance—was it effective?

The Board's final report on the accident is not expected for several months—but Air Illinois voluntarily surrendered its operating certificate while it made the FAA-ordered corrections to its operational and maintenance procedures.

But Air Illinois was not the only airline in 1983 with a serious problem triggered by its

failure to live up to the Federal Air Regulations. Global International Airways also was ordered by the FAA to suspend all flights for violating maintenance regulations. In addition, the FAA halted operations of a third airline—Guy America—again for safety violations.

What is the common thread in these three cases? Obviously, it is the question of safety.

In each of these cases, the regulations were there . . . in place . . . and known to the airlines. But they weren't being followed . . . and that failure continued until it was spotted by surveillance procedures . . . or, tragically, after the fact, by a Safety Board accident investigator.

Why did they occur and what then is the cure? I certainly don't think these examples bolster any argument for economic re-regulation. Nor is simply adding new safety regulations the answer.

What can help—I believe—is a stepped up . . . more highly visible . . . more efficient and widespread surveillance campaign by both the FAA and the air carriers themselves—particularly the new comers and the newly-expanded older operators. There is a need for an increased awareness—and a dedication to spend the necessary "dollars" to achieve that high standard of safety that can help insure economic success.

To put it another way: let the word go out that we in aviation have worked too long and too hard to allow any situation to arise where a very few corner-cutters can smear our industry's reputation by putting the public at risk.

Again, I'm not talking about the need for more regulations—the Lord knows we always seem to have a healthy supply of those. The answer may be simply a consistent and firm application of the existing regulations by the regulator and those they regulate.

The Board's concern over surveillance programs is not new. For example, several months ago, the Board testified before Congress on what it believed were shortcomings in the FAA's air carrier maintenance surveillance program. The shortcomings—which involved the efficiency of the service difficulty reporting system—were uncovered in 1979 after the crash of an American Airlines DC-10 in Chicago, and still have not been corrected to the Board's satisfaction.

Maintenance surveillance also is an issue in the Board's on-going investigation of what could qualify as one of the most dramatic incidents of 1983—the lack of engine oil seals that forced the crew of an Eastern Airlines L1011 to shut down three engines over the Atlantic and glide to less than 3,000 feet above the water before the crew was able to get a restart on a single engine.

Operational surveillance also is an issue in several on-going Board investigations, including a series of fueling incidents, one of which involved a Republic Airlines DC-9 that made an emergency landing at Luke Air Force Base outside Phoenix. A check showed less than five gallons of useable fuel left in the tanks.

In incidents such as these, the Board's investigators are obviously interested in the Airline's fuel planning procedures . . . crew training . . . coordination, and discipline . . . and the effectiveness of FAA surveillance of these issues. What we are looking for is the source of the breakdown that led to the fuel problem.

Surveillance is the key to accident prevention. It is the means to uncover the clues we need to tell us where the problems lie—before those problems compromise airline safety.

In summary, let me say this about airline safety:

People fly because they believe it is safe to fly. And they believe that because decades ago the airline industry and the government convinced them of that fact by the way they set tough safety standards. In effect, safety became the industry's "strong heart."

Nothing has changed that philosophy—we simply are not going to permit a degradation of air safety. We have not in the past, and we won't today, or tomorrow.

We—the government and the industry—must do what we have always done. We must stay alert to safety threats . . . we must search for the dangerous trends . . . we must educate and re-educate our flight crews . . . and in doing so we will keep what we have now—the safest aviation system in the world.

Thank you.●

H.R. 1961

HON. KEN KRAMER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues for their support yesterday of H.R. 1961, the Agent Orange and Atomic Veterans Relief Act. Certainly the brave men and women who now suffer from serious diseases which may be the result of their exposure to atomic radiation and toxic herbicides during military service, should not be forgotten.

As our knowledge of the adverse health effects of radiation and agent orange exposure continues to mount, the need for recognition and compensation of these veterans has become a moral responsibility we can no longer ignore.

President Reagan took the initial steps by proclaiming July 16 as "National Atomic Veterans Day," finally granting a long overdue recognition to the over one quarter of a million American servicemen who were exposed to large doses of radiation during and after nuclear explosions between 1945 and 1962.

However, our duty to these individuals does not end with this recognition. Thirty-eight years have passed since the first nuclear weapons were detonated over the New Mexican desert on July 16, 1945. In those years, veterans who witnessed nuclear tests closeup—and those who occupied Hiroshima and Nagasaki—have in many cases experienced severe health problems.

Leukemia, heart disease, sterility and bone and muscle deterioration are just a few of the ailments atomic veterans have encountered, years after exposure to nuclear fallout. More importantly, many children of atomic veterans have been born with a variety of genetic disorders where no family

history of such problems existed before. The possibility of multiple future generations feeling the genetic impact of this technology must be addressed.

Although testing and studies have not been completed, Vietnam veterans exposed to agent orange seem to suffer a high incidence of the skin disorder chloracne, soft tissue sarcomas, and the liver disorder PCT.

We have compensated the citizens of Times Beach for the health hazards of living in a dioxin poisoned community. It is important to note that veterans who served their county so valiantly during wartime were exposed to far greater concentrations of this same chemical and should be compensated for the illnesses which they may now have. Over 3,000 veterans would benefit from H.R. 1961.

This bill would allow agent orange and atomic veterans to qualify for VA disability benefits for medical problems believed to be linked to dioxin and radiation exposure. Also, it would provide similar help to natural children of atomic veterans where evidence indicates radiation related genetic disorders.

There is much we still do not know about radiation and agent orange and their effects on the human body. More research will undoubtedly confirm the relationship between exposure to nuclear fallout and dioxin to medical problems, but this could take time. The projected completion date of the agent orange study in between 1987 and 1989. Many of our veterans cannot afford to wait. H.R. 1961 would address this problem now, and honorably compensate the many men and women who defended their country and the free world. I would urge my colleagues in the Senate to join the House in approving this important legislation. ●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1984, I was unable to be here in Washington because my 2½-year-old son was undergoing surgery at Huntington Hospital. I would like the RECORD to indicate that if I had been present I would have voted "yea" on House vote No. 10, proxy voting investigation; "yea" on House vote No. 11, Agricultural Productivity Act; and "yea" on House vote No. 13, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization. ●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

KENNETH M. NELSON ON HIGH TECHNOLOGY

HON. JOHN R. MCKERNAN, JR.

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. MCKERNAN. Mr. Speaker, today America's industries are facing new challenges both at home and abroad. Our traditional industries need to modernize, our newer ones to innovate, if they are to meet rising competition in the international marketplace. The advent of high technology offers bright promise for the future, and through it America's industries may hope to overcome the challenges they now face.

High technology is not a cure-all. All too often, we use the term "high technology" without reflecting on what it means. Recently, one of my constituents, Kenneth M. Nelson, gave an important speech entitled "High Technology: A State of Mind." In this speech, delivered at the Rotary Club of Portland, Maine, Mr. Nelson examined the meaning of the term "high technology," and remarked upon the important role this new science will have in the future of our industries, universities, and regional economies.

Mr. Nelson is president of Nelson & Small, Inc., a distributor of electronics, appliances, marine and recreational products, and flooring and building products. He is chairman of the Greater Portland Regional Chamber of Commerce Committee on High Technology. He is a graduate of Bowdoin College and the Boston University School of Law.

I would like to include Mr. Nelson's speech in the record in an effort to better acquaint Members with the challenges that the development of high technology present to this Nation.

HIGH TECHNOLOGY: A STATE OF MIND

Literally hundreds of committees are in session today, around the country, trying to understand this industrial revolution which we have come to call "High Technology". So, it would be presumptuous of me to think that in 20 minutes I could summarize fairly the findings of so many thoughtful men and women, many of whom are from Maine. Instead, let me share with you some thoughts, my own to be sure, regarding just a few of the issues and challenges posed by the High Technology era. Let me follow the lawyer's habit of summarizing, at the beginning, the thoughts I would like to leave with you today.

First, more than anything else, High Technology represents a state of mind.

Second, America is on the verge of reindustrialization through high technology. The fuel for that reindustrialization is in our educational system . . . elementary to university. A good education is no longer just a personal asset. A poor education is no longer just a family's problem.

Third, America's universities are already undergoing an enormous change. The most vigorous will emerge as partners in this rein-

January 31, 1984

dustrialization, much the same way that, since the 19th century, America's state colleges played a major role in creating America's agricultural supremacy.

Fourth, those regions which see the link between their educational resources and their economic vitality will prosper.

A half century ago, Judge Learned Hand warned that the fundamental challenge to American industrial leadership would be whether the conflicts brought about by the ever-increasing special interest would prevent us, at crucial times, from effectively seeing and managing change.

Today, there is no shortage of those who eulogize America's passing as a world industrial force. But, America has a long record of fooling the forecasters of Apocalypse. Entrepreneurial economics are social, not scientific machines. What is to such forecasters the proof of pending doom is to others often the trumpet call of opportunity. A few years ago, we were assured that gas lines were permanent landscapes, that the world was bound to cartel dominance for decades. While necessity may be the mother of invention, challenge is often the midwife.

Contrary to current forecasts, the evidence is clear that our country is regaining a sense of direction, rediscovering the merit system, and increasingly prepared not only to manage change, but to inspire it. With apologies to my former profession, we even have discovered that overhead cannot be our principal product.

America today is at the gate of a reindustrialization, which involves the evolution of whole new industries, such as those in the electronics and the biomedical fields; but which also involves the literal reconstruction of many mature industries through advanced technology methods. When you are the 45th poorest state in the Union, seeing the country formulate a new vision is more than encouraging—it is a signal opportunity that there is room for participation.

We hear voices telling us that high technology will result in less employment, or will benefit only a few advanced regions. Those views remind me of the planning commission which early in the century recommended that the Patent Office be discontinued since nearly everything had been invented. The obvious truth is that no one knows how this revolution will change us. But it will change us. We do know that we are in a formidable, world wide race with the other industrialized nations for economic leadership, and that dominance will be won by those which inspire, invest in and manage change most effectively.

My own discovery that high technology is a state of mind occurred when I represented an architect who specialized in hospital design. To keep track of his billings, he had put in a computer (in those years a bold thing to do). Watching this marvel perform, Cliff Stewart began daydreaming. Suppose he could put into the computer's memory not just receivables, but building codes, zoning codes, utility and wiring requirements for operating rooms, clearances, swing requirements. Suppose he could put into the computer the collective design experience of his whole firm. Suppose he could draw with a wand instead of a pencil. He daydreamed sitting with a client listening to the questions he had listened to for years, "What would be involved, if we add two operating rooms here? . . . or moved Emergency to this wing."

He wondered if the computer could not only tell him the implications of each change, but could then draw the revisions?

Avoiding the waste of re-inventing the wheel. Some 18 years ago, with the help of MIT graduate students, Cliff Stewart developed one of the first computer aided design systems. He called it ARC 1. Their first computer could only store a few pages of data, but it worked. Eliminate an operating room and a new bill of materials punched out. Add hospital rooms and the printer not only drew the floor plan, but reminded him that the parking lot was too small.

Xerox and Carnegie Mellon joint ventured a project which would far advance Stewart's system, but today Stewart and his 30 architects design hospitals with six computer systems with terminals right on the construction site so that change orders are tested against plans, and implications reckoned with immediately.

High Technology is a state of mind which restores value to innovation, experimentation, productivity and efficiency. It is a state of mind not just limited to the fields, which are themselves high technology, but equally applicable to architecture, potato farming, tool making, shoe making and industrialization.

The fuel for a reindustrialization sparked by high technology is in the quality of our educational system for at that core is trained inquisitive brain power.

In all 50 states volunteer commissions are at work trying to diagnose the ailments of public schools. It is now widely acknowledged that we have come through nearly 20 years of continuously less educated students, declining aptitude and achievement scores (especially in math and the sciences), and a disproportionate contraction in the pool of top achievers. We in Maine must be particularly concerned because, in math and the sciences, our student performance is below even the national downward spiral. But, what is of greatest concern to the analysts is not simply that Johnny does not read, add or subtract as well as 20 years ago, but Johnny's ability to think, to reason, to do multi-step problem solving has declined significantly. Studies released, just this week, show Japanese students solve complex reasoning and math problems twice as well as American students. The impact of this declining quality has been real.

One-third of our university math and science courses today are classified as remedial, and thus short resources are stretched in catch-up activities.

Seeking an explanation for these events, the Carnegie Foundation reports American education has largely become a memorization experience at precisely the time when the premium is on thinking. Teachers lecture and students write down. Students read handouts and write it down. The Socratic method of teaching: asking questions, probing answers, dialogue, debate, making comparisons, the process of learning how to think through problems, level by level, is disappearing from many public school classrooms.

Why?

A recent poll of university students reveals that 4% desire a teaching career, compared with 20% two decades ago. As the fields of law, medicine, business, banking and industry continue to recruit women, the pool of talented women who choose teaching continues to shrink. In some places, nearly 40% of those teaching math and science in our own public schools are not certified in the subjects. If we look at the academic record of those going into teaching today at the elementary and high school level, fewer and fewer seem to be coming

from the top of the pack. At one large college of education, the academic record of the 1983 entering class of soon-to-be teachers is below the average of the university's general student body. Think about it. Those who will be teachers increasingly are not as academic as those who will be their average students. No wonder Carnegie finds a shift from dialogue to lecture, from analysis to memorization.

A friend of mine is fond of saying capital goes where it is treated kindest. Well, talent is capital. The beginning salary for a Maine public school teacher is \$10,000. After ten years of experience, maybe \$17,000. If we are not getting or keeping the teaching talent we require, one obvious reason is that the talented are getting treated better doing other things.

One of the unavoidable changes we will have to manage is a public school pay scale that recruits the people who must be recruited, if we are going to have the superior education system world competition dictates. I think it will happen because America's commitment to education is more than just self-interest; it is historic.

The most striking thing about the advanced technology revolution at the university level is the reunification of industry and the academy. Our first hint of the relationship was that the first great electronic business centers of advanced technology were Boston, Atlanta, Austin, Palo Alto, even Singapore, which also happened to be the homes of major universities and university research centers. I say reunification of industry and the academy because America's agricultural leadership was directly related to the unique establishment of land grant colleges which, for decades, served as laboratory and continuing education centers for agricultural study. Few Easterners know that California's ability to develop a vinayard industry of world class rank is directly credited to the decades of research and development jointly invested at the University of California at Davis.

University participation is essential to America's newest reindustrialization in two respects. First, universities must continue to perform their traditional role of providing basic and advanced engineering degree programs so that a reindustrialized America has the basic engineering talent to be competitive. Japan presently produces twice the engineers with two-thirds our population.

We recently surveyed the majority of advanced technology business in Southern Maine and 59 percent reported that their growth would be directly related to their ability to attract holders of BS Degrees or to have access, on a local basis, to quality BS Degree educational programs for their employees. Twenty-one percent of the businesses surveyed required personnel with Masters Degrees and, in order to keep pace with rapid change in nearly all fields of engineering, access to first class programs of continuing education. They also reported a strong interest in new specialty engineering courses in manufacturing technology, value added engineering, cost benefit analysis and robotics application.

The university laboratory is the second key element in that reindustrialization. Universities do more than 50 percent of all basic research in the United States, and while much of it is government sponsored, a tremendous change is occurring. Several years ago, Congress adopted legislation encouraging universities to obtain patents and copyrights for their own research discoveries and now certain types of software devel-

opments are copyrightable. With industry increasingly recognizing its need to finance basic research, in the last two years, we have seen an explosion of research partnerships between universities and private industry. Usually, a company or group sponsors specific basic research by the university. The results of those labors are owned by the university and then licensed back to the sponsor for use in its territory.

For example, in 1983, Stanford accepted research grants of nearly \$150,000,000 and its partnership royalty income exceeded \$1,000,000.

Many other similar basic research partnerships opened this year. MIT and Harvard jointly received a \$50,000,000 genetic research grant from a German pharmaceutical company. Harvard obtained a \$6,000,000 grant from Dupont. Monsanto entered into a multi-year \$25,000,000 partnership with Washington School of Medicine for basis research in immunology, as well as a \$50,000,000 long-term project at Harvard. Six computer firms and Stanford have formed a partnership for biotechnology process research. Michigan just announced a \$6,000,000 molecular biology research grant. These are but a few of the university-industry partnership ventures underway.

There are now 1,650 faculty engineering positions vacant nationwide. There has been a 7-year decline in the number of PHD engineering candidates. Indeed more than one-third of those engineering PHD candidates are foreign students. Many state supported universities short of engineering faculties and funds to carry out even undergraduate programs, have curtailed their PHD programs, critical to a vibrant research environment.

Those universities which are now building their research capacity and becoming participants in these industry partnerships not only are developing major long-term sources of new funding, but increasingly will be magnets for top-notch students. They will impact significantly on their regions and the industries which surround them. So, the reunification of industry and the academy in its 20th Century High-Tech version offers some enormously exciting opportunities.

The City of Portland is blessed today . . . a rejuvenated city with a remarkably array of institutions. The museum, the symphony, the hospitals, the performing arts center and the waterfront. What I have tried to suggest to you, however, is that in the long-term, its most important asset, I believe, is the University of Southern Maine.

Its new program for a Master Degree in electrical engineering, here in Portland, is a direct response to the needs of these firms whose future depends on advanced degree training. Its undergraduate program in computer sciences is a critical offering. The graduate degree program in immunology, now under study, would bring to Portland, its hospitals, and its biomedical industry the ingredients for a serious research center in genetics and allied studies, and the certain spin-off businesses which characterized the electronics research centers. The University's New Enterprise Institute is a nationally recognized model program geared to providing expertise to small entrepreneurial businesses symbolic of the high technology future.

Public institutions tend to meet public expectations. Our city has an array of institutions which just seem to get better and better. I am sure that is because the public's pride, support and expectations of excel-

lence are felt keenly by the institutions themselves.

We are in an era when the region's economic vitality depends upon the vitality and excellence of our university resources. The visions you have heard today may strike you as ambitious, but I suspect they are nothing compared to those of Bob Woodbury.

I hope we have reached the time when the voices encouraging those visions reach well beyond the University's official Alumni. Time will prove that whatever our personal colleges, we all have a great stake in this becoming, with pride, our University. ●

H.R. 2615

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, when the House debated, amended, and passed H.R. 2615, the Weatherization Act, I was absent because of official business. Had I been present, I would have voted for restricting amendments against the bill.

Our deficit is too high already. We cannot just keep adding to our already outrageous spending for every good purpose that occurs to our majority group here.

We have already appropriated one-half billion dollars for fiscal year 1984. We ought not add more to what is already too much.

The votes on January 24 have begun to separate the spenders from the deficit fighters. Those who continue to vote for more spending will simply have to accept the responsibility for the deficit. ●

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE EXONERATED

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during the last session, serious allegations were made of improper alterations of an amendment to H.R. 2461, the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1983. This amendment was adopted in legislative session of the Committee on Education and Labor, and the majority party and its staff were accused of having made the improper alterations.

The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct carried out a thorough investigation of this and other allegations of improper alterations of House documents. In its comprehensive report, "Investigation of Alleged Improper Alterations of House Documents," the Committee on Education and Labor was exonerated. Since the unfounded charges against the Committee on Education and Labor were

widely and publicly circulated at the time they were made, I think it appropriate to include in my remarks the full text of the findings and conclusions of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct from its report:

A. APRIL 20, 1983, LEGISLATIVE ACTION BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

On July 12, 1983, Representative John Erlenborn testified before the Committee on Rules that in his judgment, "a 67-word amendment *** grew to 386 words between the time it was ordered reported from the Education and Labor Committee and the time it was printed." (See Cong. Rec., daily ed., July 19, 1983, H 5242.)

The situation precipitating Representative Erlenborn's remarks and his allegation of improper alteration are set forth below.

On April 20, 1983, the Committee on Education and Labor considered H.R. 2461, the Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1983. During the markup session, the Committee Chairman, Representative Carl Perkins, offered an amendment affecting certain program authorizations. His amendment was intended to increase particular program authorizations to the target levels contained in the first budget resolution for fiscal year 1984 (H. Con. Res. 91) as passed by the House. A chart entitled, "Comparison of the Authorization Ceilings Contained in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 for fiscal year 1984 with The Assumptions in The First Budget Resolution As Passed By The House," was provided to every committee Member during the consideration of the amendment.⁶ The Chart identified nine programs having a higher figure under the budget resolution than under the ceiling established by the 1981 Reconciliation Act.⁷

The Perkins amendment stated:

SEC. 110. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for any program under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor such funding levels as are assumed under the first budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 91) for fiscal year 1984.

(b) The authorizations of appropriations under subsection (a) of this section supercede, and are not in addition to, authorizations, under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-35)."

Regarding Representative Erlenborn's allegation, the Committee obtained a copy of a portion of the transcript of the April 20, 1983, markup of H.R. 2461. The following discussion took place:

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Murphy and myself are offering an amendment and we are adding a new section, 110. A, there are authorized to be appropriated for any program under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor such funding levels as are assumed under the first budget resolution, H. Con. Resolution 91 for the fiscal year 1984.

B, the Authorization of appropriations under Subsection A of this Section supercede and are not in addition to authorizations under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35.

Now, what this does—

⁶ The Committee points out that, despite the clear intent of the amendment, H. Con. Res. 91 does not contain specific program authorizations. This matter was noted in a July 19, 1983, letter from Representative Perkins, discussed infra.

⁷ The programs were compensatory education, impact aid, education for the handicapped, vocational education, arts and humanities, Department of Education salaries and expenses, community services block grants, low-income energy assistance, and the women, infants, and children program.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, might I reserve a point of order on the amendment?

Mr. PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. ERLBORN. I'll just reserve it and let's debate it. [Laughter.]

I'll think about the reasons as we are debating it. [Laughter.]

I thank you very much.

Mr. PERKINS. We bring some programs here up to the Fiscal Year 1984 first budget resolution, the compensatory education, chapter one, and the migrant education, and the impact aid from 475 to 505 and education for the handicapped from \$1.17 billion up to \$1.226 billion, and vocational education from \$375 million up to \$937 million, which was in the first budget resolution, and Mr. Murphy may want to make a statement at this time.

Mr. MURPHY. The amendment by the Chairman is to allow the appropriations process and the budget process the flexibility that will be necessary if we find that we, as a majority in Congress, want to increase the funding, and most of these of course, again, would be discretionary but at least allows the appropriations process the flexibility of adding a few dollars here and there for the programs as they may see fit and that have been recommended through the budget process.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. PERKINS. Go ahead, Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Chairman, I must admit to being caught by surprise with this amendment, having no knowledge of it until it was put before me a minute ago.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, we just decided on it a few moments ago. [Laughter.]

Mr. ERLBORN. I kind of thought that there was very little thought put into this. [Laughter.]

First of all, for those who are truly interested in the bill before us, may I point out that this amendment is not germane to the bill, and that's why I was reserving a point of order, or I thought I had. I reserved it for a very brief time apparently. But it is really not germane to this bill because it affects every program, the authorized level for every program within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PERKINS. No, let me say to the gentleman entitlement programs like the school lunch program, that will have to come in a separate bill but the other programs under—not under entitlements.

Mr. ERLBORN. That's why I said the authorization level. It certainly would not change the formula for entitlement. But the authorization levels of every program within the jurisdiction of this committee.

Now, might I just suggest that if this, its obvious purpose—

Mr. PERKINS. It only affects, let me say to the gentleman, nine programs where we have jurisdiction over some 40 or 50 here.

Mr. ERLBORN. Well, let me say that its obvious purpose is not to lower authorizations but, rather, to increase them. . . .

The Committee's understanding of the above-quoted portions of the April 20, 1983, markup session is that Representative Murphy clearly stated that the Perkins amendment affected (by way of increase) the authorization on only nine programs, not every program within the Committee on Education and Labor's jurisdiction, as Representative Erlenborn had argued. The chart Chairman Perkins provided to Members also established this feature of the amendment. The Perkins amendment was subsequently agreed to by an 18-9 vote. The Committee on Education and Labor, by

voice vote, then agreed to a motion by Representative Murphy to report H.R. 2461, as amended, and to allow the staff to make necessary technical and conforming amendments. (The Committee notes that Representative Erlenborn's point of order was overruled. No view is expressed on whether the objection (apparently based on the germaneness of the Perkins amendment) was well-founded.)

It further appears that Representatives Erlenborn, Goodling, Gunderson, Bartlett, and Nielson came to understand the limited effects of the amendment. Specifically, the Education and Labor Committee report on H.R. 2461 (H. 98-137) contained the following statement by the named Members (in their dissenting views) concerning the Perkins amendment.

This amendment, as offered, in conjunction with comments of the Chairman, its sponsor, would have the effect of increasing authorization of appropriation ceilings for 1984 for selected programs by more than \$1.3 billion over the ceilings for those programs set in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981.

The minority report went on to complain about the increased length of the printed (reported) amendment as compared with the brevity of the introduced version. (The Committee notes that Chairman Perkins referred to 9 programs during the April 20 markup although 10 were listed in the Republican Members' dissenting views, quoted above. The Committee determined that Chairman Perkins' amendment treated two programs as one because of the President's proposal to consolidate the vocational and adult education programs into a single block grant. The 10 programs listed by Representative Erlenborn, et al., were the same referred to by Chairman Perkins on April 20, 1983.)

The Committee has also obtained a copy of a July 19, 1983, letter Representative Perkins sent to Representative Claude Pepper, Chairman, Committee on Rules, regarding Representative Erlenborn's allegation that the subject amendment had been improperly altered. The letter stated, in part:

INTENT OF AMENDMENT

My amendment did, as described in the Minority report, go from 67 words to over 380 words. Those 380 words, however, were substantially more precise in describing what the Committee intended than my original language.

Title IV as reported increased the total authorizations of ten programs within our jurisdiction by \$1.35 billion. The revision did not change the cost of the amendment; the original and the revised language were both tied to the same set of figures, the assumptions in the House-passed version of the budget resolution.

The reason for revising the amendment stems from the complexity of the budget process. As you know, it is only since the 1981 Reconciliation Act that authorizing Committees have become involved with budget assumptions, authorization ceilings, and budget targets. This new, complex process requires new approaches in authorizing legislation and presents new difficulties in drafting amendments that are technically correct.

As originally drafted, the amendment referred to "such funding levels as are assumed under the first budget resolution." This was intended to be a concise way of covering all ten programs whose authorizations were being increased. I believed these levels were known to all, since passage of a

budget resolution generates much discussion about the individual program funding levels on which the total budget ceilings in the resolution are based.

Soon after the Committee mark-up, I learned that these "assumptions" are not always printed in the public reports and records dealing with the budget resolution.

Thus, to tie my amendment to "assumptions" which do not have any official standing would cause a great deal of confusion. So, in order to carry out the clear intent of the Committee during the mark-up, the figures for each program as shown on the chart which everyone had at the meeting were incorporated into the text of the amendment itself.

The staff did not exceed the authority given it by the Committee to make technical and conforming amendments. No one can deny that the language in the reported bill was a more accurate, more specific reflection of what I intended and what the Committee intended when it adopted my amendment. No one was confused, no one was deceived, there was no misrepresentation and the Committee's intention was accurately reflected in the reported bill.

The thrust of Representatives Erlenborn's objection is two-pronged. First, he argued the Perkins amendment was not germane to the bill, H.R. 2461. Whether this proposition is correct is a matter not relevant to the investigation under House Resolution 254.

Second, Representative Erlenborn argued that the staff erred in revising the amendment pursuant to the authority granted by Representative Murphy's motion; an error tantamount to an improper alteration of the original language of the amendment. In stating his objections to the Committee on Rules during its meeting on July 12, 1983, Representative Erlenborn observed that the amendment was extensively revised to address two concerns: That based on the chart (which accompanied the amendment) the original text had the unintended effect of also reducing 15 program authorizations rather than just increasing nine. To eliminate this problem, Representative Erlenborn argued that the staff altered the amendment to affect only programs which stood to gain in authorized dollars. This was accomplished by adding language (a new subsection (c) to the amendment) identifying the programs affected.

The revisers, in Representative Erlenborn's view also improperly added words making clear the amendment affected only funding levels assumed under the first budget resolution, "as it passed the House on March 23, 1983," to avoid the problem of the House-Senate conferees on the First Budget Resolution agreeing on lower levels than those assumed in the House-passed version.

CONCLUSION

The Committee concludes that this allegation does not involve an improper alteration. The revised language was apparently a more precise articulation of the intent of the original amendment, having no effect on cost or the programs covered. Specifically, the amendment was clearly intended to reach nine programs for the purpose of increasing authorization levels to those assumed in the House-passed version of H. Con. Res. 91. Further, as evidence by materials provided during consideration of the amendment and the discussion thereon, Representative Erlenborn and others clearly understood the full intent and scope of the proposal. Finally, the motion by Repre-

sentative Murphy expressly authorized the staff to revise the amendment. The Committee expresses no view on whether the amendment was germane or whether the staff's revision exceeded accepted technical or conforming practices. ●

THE CONGRESSIONAL PAY RESPONSIBILITY ACT

HON. TOM VANDERGRIF

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. VANDERGRIF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will receive the President's 1984 budget proposal, and, no doubt, we will be asked to make difficult decisions in our attempt to reduce the deficit. To be candid, however, I would hope that this Congress will see fit to do more than merely put a down payment toward our goal of a balanced budget.

Our Senate colleagues have already acted to repeal last year's vote to increase congressional pay, which, I might add, I vehemently opposed and voted against. I am hopeful we in the House will soon have the opportunity to follow suit. If we are to make a real impact on the deficit, we all must do our part. We can ask no less of ourselves than we will ask of the American people. But, Mr. Speaker, in addition to repealing this ill-conceived and ill-timed pay raise, we must insure that Congress cannot again approve a pay increase for itself without full public scrutiny. We must take steps to restore the public's confidence in the Congress which has been further eroded by allowing this pay raise to take effect.

To this end, I am today introducing legislation to require a separate recorded vote on any measure which would grant a pay increase to Members of Congress. Our constituents have a right to know how we vote on these matters. In addition, my bill would prevent any pay increase from taking effect until we return home, face our constituents, and are asked to return as their representative.

I know that most of our constituents find such a pay raise difficult to accept at this time. I most certainly share this sentiment, as long as the deficit remains at catastrophic levels, while there are still so many people unemployed, and when this body is considering tax increases and more deep cuts in social programs.

My proposal, the Congressional Pay Responsibility Act, by itself, will not result in a balanced budget, nor will repealing the pay increase already in effect. These, however, are the very first and the very least steps we should take. Until such time as we take these steps, I will return to the U.S. Treasury the amount of this and

any subsequent pay raise with instructions that the sum be applied toward reducing the deficit. I know that the impact of this action is small in comparison to the size of the deficit, yet it is simply the very least I can personally do. I owe it to the people of the 26th Congressional District in Texas, and, indeed, to all the taxpayers of this Nation. I urge my colleagues to join in my efforts, and I ask that the text of my bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Thank you.

H.R. 4703

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Congressional Pay Responsibility Act".

SEC. 2. (a)(1) Paragraph (2) of section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31), relating to congressional salary adjustment, is amended by striking out "Effective at the beginning of the first applicable pay period commencing on or after the first day of the month in which an adjustment takes effect under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule," and inserting in lieu thereof "Effective at the beginning of the Congress next following any Congress during which an adjustment takes effect under section 5305 of title 5, United States Code, in the rates of pay under the General Schedule."

(2) Such section 601(a) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) The rates of pay for positions referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection recommended by the President under subsection (h) of section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (2 U.S.C. 358) in any year shall take effect on the later of (A) the beginning of the Congress next following the Congress during which the recommendations for such rates of pay were transmitted by the President under such subsection or (B) the date prescribed by the President under subsection (i)(2) of such section (2 U.S.C. 359(2))."

(b)(1) Subsection (h) of section 225 of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (2 U.S.C. 358) is amended—

(A) by striking out "include, in the budget" and all that follows through "Commission" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "transmit to the Congress, within the period of fifteen calendar days beginning on the date on which the Congress convenes for the first session which begins after the date on which the report and recommendations of the Commission are required to be submitted", and

(B) by striking out the second sentence.

(2) Paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of such section (2 U.S.C. 359(1)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(A)" after "(1)";

(B) in the first sentence—

(i) by inserting "the office of Vice President of the United States and" before "the offices and positions"; and

(ii) by striking out "(A)";

(C) in the third sentence—

(i) by striking out "described in any such subparagraph" and inserting in lieu thereof "referred to in the first sentence of this subparagraph"; and

(ii) by striking out "the offices and positions covered by such subparagraph" and in-

serting in lieu thereof "such offices and positions"; and

(D) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(B) The rates of pay for offices and positions within the purview of subsection (f)(A) of this section (other than the office of Vice President of the United States) recommended by the President under subsection (h) of this section in any year shall take effect as provided in section 601(a)(3) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 31(3))."

(3) Subsection (j) of such section (2 U.S.C. 360) is amended—

(A) by striking out "if approved by the Congress as provided in subsection (i)" and inserting in lieu thereof "upon taking effect as provided in subsection (i)"; and

(B) by striking out "(other than any provision of law enacted in the period specified in paragraph (1) of subsection (i) of this section with respect to such recommendations)" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than any provision of law which, in the case of any recommendation to which subsection (i)(1)(A) of this section applies, is enacted in the period specified in such subsection (i)(1)(A) with respect to such recommendation or which, in the case of any recommendation to which subsection (i)(1)(B) of this section applies, is enacted with respect to such recommendation after the date of which the President transmitted such recommendation to the Congress)".

SEC. 3. (a) For purposes of this section, the term "Member of the Congress" means any person who holds the office of Senator, Member of the House of Representatives, Delegate to the House of Representatives, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, President pro tempore of the Senate, majority or minority leader of the Senate or the House of Representatives, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(b)(1) It shall not be in order in either the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution which includes an appropriation, or a limitation on the use of appropriated funds, for the compensation of Member of the Congress for any fiscal year or part of a fiscal year if such bill or joint resolution also includes an appropriation, or a limitation on appropriations, for any other purpose.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection is enacted by the Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

(c) The vote of each House on each bill or joint resolution which includes an appropriation, or a limitation on the use of appropriated funds, for the compensation of Members of the Congress for any fiscal year or part of a fiscal year shall be recorded so as to reflect the vote of each Member of the Congress thereon. ●

KEN TOMLINSON AND THE NEW
VOA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to recommend to all of my friends in the House an excellent article about the Voice of America and its new Director, Ken Tomlinson. I want to commend Mr. Ken Tomlinson for his fine efforts in giving new life to the Voice.

Let me put in perspective his contributions to America's voice to the world. It is ironic that the most powerful and technologically advanced Nation in the world should tell its story to the masses around the globe with antiquated equipment, insufficient staff, and inadequate budgets. The powerful and modern transmitters operated by the Soviets, their Eastern European allies, and their surrogates in the Caribbean are literally overwhelming the Voice's signals and keeping these transmissions from reaching an increasingly growing overseas audience that desperately wants to hear the truth about America, and the truth about what is going on in the world.

All too often, Americans returning from overseas tell how difficult it is to find Voice of America broadcasts on the shortwave listening bands. Radio Moscow, however, is clearly heard even in distant parts of the globe. Why should we let this appalling situation continue when the remedy is at our fingertips?

All of this is happening at a crucial time. More than ever before, this is a period in our Nation's history when truth and democracy are being challenged throughout the world. This is a time when the forces of totalitarianism are more powerful, more determined and more aggressive than ever before. Today is also a period when the expectations of millions around the globe have never been greater. More than ever before, people want uncensored information and know the importance of having that information sent to them. Today, we are witnessing a communications explosion and the Voice of America must be on the cutting edge in both technology, program presentation, and content.

Thanks to the energetic efforts of Charles Z. Wick, the head of the U.S. Information Agency, and the determined efforts of Ken Tomlinson, a program is underway to modernize the Voice so that our broadcasts can again be heard in the distant corners of the world.

With these thoughts in mind, I strongly recommend this article which presents both the philosophy and the

new image which Ken Tomlinson is bringing to the Voice. I wish him and his staff success and good fortune in their undertakings.

The article follows:

[From the Journal of Defense & Diplomacy, Dec. 1983]

INTERVIEW: KEN TOMLINSON

(Ken Tomlinson has been the director of the Voice of America since December 1982. He began his journalism career as a reporter with the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch. In 1968, he left to join the staff at Reader's Digest. While at the Digest, he was assigned to the magazine's Paris-based European editorial office and its Washington bureau. In 1981, he became a senior editor at the Digest's New York headquarters, a position he held until he was appointed the head of the VOA.)

JODD. What is the general purpose of the Voice of America? Why do you think the United States should have an organization like the VOA?

TOMLINSON. We say at the Voice of America that the standard and the purpose are the same. It's to tell the truth; it's to get out the truth. When we went on the air in 1942, we told our audience that the news may be good from the standpoint of the United States, the news may be bad from the standpoint of the United States, but you'll get the truth on the Voice of America. It's an essential precept of democracy that truth will prevail. I think that in maintaining the high standards of international broadcasting, maintaining the standards as we are required to by law, to broadcast comprehensively and objectively about what's going on in the world, that we serve that higher purpose. We have to remember, too, that the founding fathers of this country were, in many ways, the first national political group which asserted that the free flow of information is essential, that the people have a right to facts and opinions and that the people can use this information to choose, and choose wisely.

Now, some people in the United States have a difficult time understanding why it's so important to have an international radio voice, because they live in a media-saturated society, even with the decline of newspapers in this country. Virtually every household has a television set, has a radio, newspapers, magazines, and they think, "Why should the U.S. government be in the radio broadcasting business?" The answer to that question is that we're unique in terms of this wealth of access to information. Our audiences in totalitarian countries and in the third world literally depend on the Voice of America, the BBC and other western broadcasters for what is really going on in the world.

Finally, I think that the Voice of America and other western broadcasters serve what, in long term, is a mission of peace. We believe that if totalitarian leaders are convinced that their people will learn the truth from international broadcasts, that that might have an effect on their potential for war-like actions. If they know that they are going to be judged by their own people—if they know their people are going to have access to the actions of the leaders—this will serve as a check on the pursuits of totalitarian leaders. I think that's why the Soviet Union has put such great emphasis on jamming, for example. It's well known the Soviets spend more to jam western broadcasts than we spend on our entire Voice of America worldwide budget.

JODD. There is an ongoing debate over whether the VOA is a news and information service or whether it's an active tool of U.S. foreign policy—a propaganda organ, for lack of a better name. Conservatives, for example, have often said that the VOA has not been aggressive enough in directly combating anti-American propaganda and Soviet misinformation. As some people put it, the Voice of America is mumbling. Liberals, on the other hand, are afraid that the VOA could just become a U.S. version of Radio Moscow.

TOMLINSON. The mission of the Voice of America was set forth very clearly in a law passed in 1976. One, we are to serve as an objective and a comprehensive news operation. Our listeners around the world should be able to hear the news in the highest traditions of journalism on the Voice of America. Now, I do note that the mandate for balance on the Voice of America is balance within the American political spectrum. It's not balance halfway between Washington and Moscow. Nevertheless, the mandate is clear in the law.

Point two of the law is that we should reflect and convey the essence of American institutions to give the world a sense of what this country is all about—difficult journalism, and yet very, very doable.

Part three says that the Voice of America shall present the official positions of the United States government, and we now do so through our editorials. We've instituted, in the last couple of years, an editorial page on the Voice of America where people can hear a reflection of views of the U.S. government. These editorials are clearly labeled. They are brief, but they do convey daily positions of this government on a myriad of subjects.

I've been listening to the VOA for many years and I, in many ways, became interested in the Voice of America in the first place because of what I felt as a journalist based abroad to be very clear shortcomings in VOA broadcasting. Not so much in regard to news, although I think we've had a significant improvement in our news in the last couple of years as we've moved to 10-minute news broadcasts at the top of the hour, as we moved to greater depth in our news coverage and longer news programs, but I was concerned as a listener that I was not getting the quality of current affairs programs that I had on the BBC. The Voice of America did not really have an equivalent of the BBC's "World Today," a program that takes a significant issue of the day and focuses on it, using a number of authorities from across the political spectrum. It was the kind of "focus programming" in the current affairs area that I thought was missing from VOA. It seemed to me that responsible critics of the VOA, both from the left and the right, could be satisfied by raising the quality, depth and relevance of the product, and this is the first thing we set out to do. We now have a program called "Focus" which takes a significant issue of the day and, utilizing authorities from various points in the U.S. political spectrum, produces enlightened facts and opinion on these topics.

I felt, that, to use a phrase I've used many times, the Voice of America should reflect the voices of America. I heard a greater reflection of the voices of Britain and the world on the BBC than I did on VOA. In the current affairs area, we traditionally did our inside view. Or, if we did go outside the institution or bring someone else in, we'd put out a microphone and have a 30-minute

interview with one person, as opposed to blending many voices on the topic. To change this, we've added viewpoint commentaries. Not for the purpose of point-counterpoint broadcasting, although the people are free to disagree, but for the purposes of giving the world a sense of how American opinion is formed on the left and right and in the center. I think an essential function of the Voice of America is to reflect what America is, and if you examine what's at the heart of American tradition, you quickly see the importance of pluralism. We have a political right and we have a political left and we have a political center. We have a congress, we have a judiciary, and we have the executive branch. And, if anyone around the world wants to understand this country, that person is going to have to come to grips with the diversity of opinion that graces our democracy. Those people should be exposed to the attitudes of the major segments of American political philosophy. They should get a sense of how leaders at various points in the American political spectrum come to their conclusions; we try to give them that in "Viewpoints." We've added, for example, an expanded opinion roundup. We've added a feature of reflecting what's in the American press and what's in the magazine press. Again, to give the world a sense of what American voices are saying.

JODD. How easy is that, considering some of the audiences? Much of your audience, for example, is in countries that have state-controlled medias, and it has been said before that perhaps some of these audiences may not be sophisticated enough to see what you're trying to get across—that the United States is a pluralistic society—since that is often a rather subtle message.

TOMLINSON. Well, in the first place, I think it has to be understood that within the American political spectrum, you do not have a great deal of disagreement over the big picture aspects of a number of issues. Is there disagreement in this country about what's happened in Afghanistan? No. Is there disagreement about what's happened in Poland or the right of workers to organize, or major segments of the human rights picture? No. But, I think as much as possible, it is important for our listeners in English, as well as our listeners in the 41 other languages we broadcast in, to hear the thoughts and opinions of Americans, and of significant people residing in this country, on important issues.

For example, one of the most significant programs ever to be broadcast on the Voice of America is a series we now have running in our Russian service called, "Conversations with Rostropovich." We recently went with our first in this series, which is patterned after Eric Severeld's, "Conversations with Eric Hoffer," in the 1960s—an incredibly significant television series. Mstislav Rostropovich is one of the most remarkable figures of our time, and from his vantage point, he has much to say to the people of the world and particularly the people of the USSR, in terms of comparing life in the Soviet Union, where he grew up and lived for many years, and life in the United States, where he is now. The first program with Rostropovich was amazingly credible because he spoke very carefully about the pluses and the minuses of his life growing up in the Soviet Union and of life in the West, although it is clear which system he favors. The best broadcasting we can give the world is broadcasting that involves significant American opinion makers, which in-

volves the best that the United States has to offer.

JODD. What does the Voice of America do in order to keep itself from being mistaken by a foreign audience as just another version of Radio Moscow? Apparently, some people don't see the Voice of America as credible as, say, the BBC, because there's a tendency on the part of some people to say, "Oh, they're just broadcasting propaganda like Radio Moscow is." How do you combat such a problem like that—a built-in bias against the Voice of America?

TOMLINSON. With our news. Anyone who listens to our news for 15 seconds and then listens to the news of Radio Moscow for 15 seconds has no problem discerning that one is factual, credible and truthful, and the other is not.

I think we're slowly getting this message across in this country. I think in the past year there has been a rather remarkable turnaround in the image of the Voice of America as we have, number one, improved the quality of our product and made it a product comparable with any journalism in the world. And combat the bias by communicating to Americans, who rarely, if ever, listen to the Voice of America, just what we are and how high our standards are.

JODD. So the big problem is just getting them to listen in the first place.

TOMLINSON. People around the world are listening. Our listening audience in the People's Republic of China, for example, has grown incredibly in recent years according to informal estimates. We have the formal estimates of this tremendous increase in our audience in eastern Europe. Our audience in the Soviet Union, likewise, has grown despite jamming. The Voice of America has tremendous credibility around the world. It's unfortunate that what was sometimes a rather foolish domestic debate about what the Voice of America should be served somehow to tarnish the image of what Voice of America is.

Let me make clear, as I said many times, that as a journalist, I had many problems with the creativity, relevance and professionalism of the VOA's product that I heard over the years in the nonnews area. But I think we've had a significant increase in the quality, professionalism and relevance of our broadcasts. I think you're going to see a continued increase in that professionalism. And, the real test, I think, is something that I do from time to time. I take a typical Voice of America program—"Newswire," for example—and I send it to an informal mailing list of roughly 16 congressmen and senators, half Republican, half Democrat, half liberal, half conservative, and I say, "We aren't perfect, but listen to this and I think you'll agree it represents good broadcasting." To date, the reaction from both sides of the political aisle has been very positive.

JODD. As a way of comparison, could you give me some rough figures on the VOA worldwide audience versus Radio Moscow?

TOMLINSON. We have an overwhelming lead in numbers despite the fact that Radio Moscow broadcasts in roughly twice the languages and in infinitely more hours than we broadcast in. You can travel the globe and you'll be able to find the Radio Moscow signal loud and clear at many points on your shortwave dial. You'll have to strain in many places to hear the Voice of America. Even so, we have a worldwide listening audience of more than 100 million. We believe confidently that we're the most listened-to international broadcaster in the world and that in terms of serious listeners, Radio

Moscow is not even close. It is, after all, not a relevant international broadcasting operation. It's totalitarian propaganda.

JODD. You talked about your editorials and their reflecting the opinions of the U.S. government; who writes those?

TOMLINSON. Those editorials are written in our policy office at the Voice of America, which is in close touch with significant people throughout government, White House, NSC [National Security Council], State Department and Department of Defense. The editorials have been very, very popular with the leaders of our government. But, I hasten to add that those editorials will change in substance and tone depending on what the leadership is in Washington. Those editorials reflect the views of our current government.

JODD. The administration, you mean, I was wondering if you also meant congress.

TOMLINSON. Of the government in power, although we are very careful to send members of congress across the political spectrum copies of those editorials. The editorials also have helped us in stopping this left-right tugging for control of the Voice of America's microphone. It has given elements of the government a place to go to convey U.S. policies.

U.S. policies should not be mixed with the news. U.S. policies should not be inserted in news and current affairs broadcasting. There should be a place in our broadcast hour where listeners around the world can turn to for something reflecting the official U.S. government position. The news at the top of the hour does not necessarily reflect the views of the government. The views may be good or it may be bad from the standpoint of the government. The editorials have been very important in enabling us to fulfill part three of the law which governs us—that we shall reflect U.S. government policy while preserving the journalistic sanctity of other aspects of our program.

JODD. I understand that some of your equipment was captured from the Nazis at the end of World War II and is still in use, and that little of your equipment is less than 15 years old, and a good deal of it is more than 30. How does this affect the Voice of America's ability to broadcast around the world, for one, and what steps are being currently taken to update and modernize the equipment?

TOMLINSON. Well, it simply means that with each passing year, the Voice of America becomes weaker and weaker around the world. You cannot expect a 30-year-old transmitter to release the broadcast power that that transmitter could provide two or three decades ago. And this constitutes a national disgrace. It is nothing short of scandalous when people in Iran, Afghanistan, major chunks of the Soviet Union and many places in Africa, write us, saying, "Why cannot we hear your signal as clearly as we could years ago?" The answer is deceptively simple. The equipment is largely antiquated. Fortunately, we have a president and a head of the United States Information Agency, Charles Wick, who are committed to rebuilding the Voice of America. President Reagan took one of his weekly national broadcasts to call attention to the condition of our facilities. Now, of course, something that took many, many years to waste away, is going to take a good deal of time to replace. It takes approximately three years from start to finish to design, procure and install a shortwave transmitter relay station, with the antennas and all the equipment involved. It takes time to build up the

engineering expertise that we're going to need to replace equipment around the world and put in units and installations where we need to send a stronger signal. Also, in this time of government austerity, it's very, very difficult for an institution which has not spent money in many years on modernization to gather the momentum to obtain the funding. But, I'm saying because of the president's personal interest in it, because of the great support that we have on Capitol Hill, because of the support and commitment that we have in this country to international broadcasting, that in the next year, you're going to see real movement toward a six-year program that is going to result in state-of-the-art broadcasting and that will also seek significant short-term increases in the quality of the signal we send around the world.

JODD. The recently created Radio Marti will broadcast solely and directly to Cuba under the auspices of the Voice of America. How exactly is Radio Marti going to be organized and what will be its editorial content?

TOMLINSON. Radio Marti will meet the legal standards established for the Voice of America in terms of accuracy and journalistic professionalism. But, congress also said that we will allow, established within the Voice of America, a Cuban-service Marti program that will be administered separately from the main stream of the Voice of America and which will serve a different function from the rest of the Voice of America. That is, to broadcast to the people of Cuba about conditions in Cuba and about things involving Cuban interest around the world. Many of the details are being decided, but two things about the Marti program are absolutely essential. Number one, credibility. This program must have the credibility of the Voice of America, both in its news and in its historical and current affairs broadcasting to Cuba, about Cuba. Number two, a key to Radio Marti is going to be a large and effective research organization. You cannot rip and read Associated Press, UPI or Reuters and broadcast to Cuba about Cuba. You have to have a significant and highlevel research operation. But, we think that as difficult as it might appear, that it is doable to have VOA standards and still have broadcasting to Cuba, about Cuba, on topics of great interest to the Cuban people.

JODD. What do you think of Castro's threats of jamming Radio Marti? Do you think that he has the capability for doing it?

TOMLINSON. We'll see. I have a feeling that we're going to surprise a lot of people with the quality of these broadcasts. After all, in the area of entertainment alone, most significant Cuban entertainers now live in this country. Marti will be a station that will provide news, information and entertainment. It's going to be a bright station in stark contrast to the drabness of Castro's government propaganda. Will he jam it? Only time will tell. You know, we have never been jammed in English in the Soviet Union because many people believe that the Soviet elite—a substantial percentage of which speaks English—wants to have access to information about what's really happening in the world. Maybe Castro will find Marti broadcasting so interesting and entertaining that there will be considerable opposition to jamming this great new sound.

We should not be dissuaded from filling this gap in international broadcasting because of fears of jamming. All of us involved

in journalism believe that the exchange of opinion and information in the long run serves the cause of peace.●

BULLETPROOF VESTS MAY SOON OUTLIVE THEIR USEFULNESS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, over half of our Nation's 528,000 law enforcement officers currently wear soft body armor on a daily basis. The U.S. Justice Department estimates that these bulletproof vests have saved over 400 police lives since they first started being used in the mid-1970's.

As a 23-year veteran of the New York City Police Department—and one who was wounded 10 times in the line of duty—I am most impressed by the added protection these vests provide to police. However, I am also greatly distressed that these vests may soon outlive their usefulness. The reason: Criminals have access to armor-piercing handgun ammunition.

Since 1980, I have been pushing for a Federal ban against armor-piercing handgun ammunition that can penetrate the soft body armor worn by law enforcement officers. While some progress toward that goal has been made, my legislation—H.R. 953—and its Senate companion—S. 555, authored by Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN—remain stalled in committee.

The logic behind my proposal is simple: All handgun cartridges capable of penetrating the 18-layer Kevlar vest most often worn by police would be outlawed, except for military and police use. My bill, entitled the "Law Enforcement Officers Protection Act," would also provide a mandatory 1- to 10-year prison sentence for any person convicted of using these bullets in a crime.

My legislative effort has been endorsed by individual police departments and major police organizations across the country, including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Fraternal Order of Police, the International Union of Police Associations, and the International Brotherhood of Police Officers. Over 140 editorial boards across the country have called for a Federal ban on armor-piercing handgun ammunition. Further, my bill has 182 cosponsors to date, and the Senate measure has 17.

Nevertheless, this legislation remains stalled in committee. The major reason is a reluctance on the part of the Reagan administration to endorse my bill, or to offer alternative legislation of their own.

The Reagan administration has long given assurances that they share my

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

deep concern about the serious threats armor-piercing ammunition poses to our law enforcement community. In fact, they made a statement early in 1983 that they expected to complete a study on this issue and submit legislation to Congress banning the armor-piercing handgun ammunition by the summer of 1983. That deadline has long since come and gone.

In a report dated November 7, 1983, Assistant U.S. Attorney General Robert A. McConnell told me that—

It would be speculative at this point to suggest precisely when an administration bill (to ban armor-piercing handgun bullets) will be submitted. In fact, in light of the difficulties we have encountered to date, it would be speculative to state that such a proposal will be submitted to the Congress * * * there is much yet to be done and I cannot say with any certainty how events will unfold * * *. The difficult nature of the project, however, and the necessity of precision in the definition of armor-piercing ammunition, have made this a more lengthy process than we had hoped.

I remain hopeful that a Federal ban against armor-piercing handgun ammunition can be enacted this year. In the meantime, it is important to remember that as the number of police officers wearing bulletproof vests continues to grow dramatically, criminals have more reason to seek and use armor-piercing "cop killer" bullets.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a New York Post article of January 25, 1984, with a headline that read "Bulletproof Vest Saves Cop From A Sniper":

BULLETPROOF VEST SAVES COP FROM A SNIPER

(By Glenn MacDonald)

A New Jersey police detective was shot in the chest by a sniper yesterday—but his bulletproof vest saved him from anything worse than bruises.

Miraculously, said Mark Adamson, 29, he decided to wear the bulky vest yesterday "for the first time in a month."

Officers swarmed into a 14-story housing project in Bayonne after the attack and took a suspect into custody, but he was released after questioning.

Three shots were believed fired at the detective as he stepped out of his unmarked car outside the projects, and one slug slammed into his stomach, doubling him in half.

"It hit me like a fist," Adamson told The Post.

"I doubled over and fell on the ground and my partner radioed for an ambulance. At first, I didn't know what it was, then I felt a stinging sensation on my chest."

The seven-year police veteran said he had been lax lately about wearing the life-saving vest.

"I'm going home to my wife, Karen, and try to relax," Adamson said after the shooting.

"I know I'm going to say a prayer of thanks that my life was spared."

"He had his vest on, luckily, and he's OK," said a fellow detective. "If he didn't have his vest on, he probably would be dead."

Adamson was shot at 9:30 a.m., just as he stepped from his car into the parking lot of

the City Line Mini Mall shopping center on Kennedy Blvd. in Bayonne.

His partner, Tony Nardini, said Adamson was getting out of the car when he suddenly doubled over.●

IT IS TIME THIS COUNTRY HAD AN ONGOING NATIONAL NUTRITION MONITORING AND RELATED RESEARCH PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to an editorial printed in the San Bernardino Sun regarding the President's Task Force on Food Assistance established to assess hunger in America. This article addresses many of my longstanding concerns about our ability and approach to eliminate hunger. Members of the task force stated there definitely was hunger in America, but concluded that lack of hard facts blocked the legitimate documentation of the severity of the problem.

The lack of timely, objective data on the dietary and nutritional status of Americans, and the lack of timely data on other factors which could effectively guide the expenditure of public funds for related nutrition research and education and which could alert policymakers to an emerging "hunger" crisis, are not new phenomena. It is time to take corrective action to put an end to this phenomenon and repudiate the excuse that adequate data are not available.

In the past, each time hunger and malnutrition concerns surfaced, the President or the Congress urgently initiated short-term and piecemeal surveys. Some of these surveys were designed to periodically obtain data on the dietary and nutritional status of a representative sample of the population. Other studies represented a one-time effort to assess high-risk groups and geographic areas. Such reactive efforts included: In 1935, USDA Food Consumption Surveys, repeated at 10-year intervals and now known as the Nationwide Food Consumption Survey; in 1967, a congressional mandate which resulted in the Ten-State Nutrition Survey; in 1971, a presidential directive which transformed the National Nutrition Surveillance Survey into what we know today as the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES); in 1977, a congressional mandate in the Food and Agriculture Act for a proposal for a Comprehensive National Nutrition Monitoring System.

Unfortunately, as the President's Task Force on Food Assistance discov-

ered, studies of this type require time and usually become available long after the urgency which prompted their mandate has passed. Thus, perceived immediate public needs were addressed through policies and intervention strategies without the benefit of the studies' findings.

As a result of the 1977 Food and Agriculture Act, we now have an implementation plan for a National Nutrition Monitoring System. Unfortunately, that plan does not address the reoccurring need for the continuous collection and interpretation of data. Thus neither timely or baseline data are available to assess changes in agriculture and health policies to reverse undesirable trends and enhance desirable trends, or make comparisons of the degree of change over time. In addition, the plan does not provide for resources to improve monitoring methods or techniques which increase the value of the data and reduce the cost of data collection and analysis.

As a former chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research and Foreign Agriculture, I have studied this problem for many years. During the past 6 years, these two subcommittees have conducted oversight hearings on human nutrition research and monitoring. A recent hearing held in July 1983 addressed "The Role of the Federal Government in Human Nutrition Research." The perspectives and suggestions of specialists within the field have prompted Congressmen MACKEY, WALGREN and myself to conclude that there is a very real need for a coordinated nutrition monitoring and related research program.

Today we have introduced legislation to establish a nutrition monitoring and related research program. It calls for a comprehensive plan for the assessment and maintenance of the nutritional and dietary status of the U.S. population, as well as the nutritional quality of the U.S. food supply. This proposed solution will initiate the continuous collection of current information, and design a system for organizing the many individual studies and surveys within our country. This will be done in a manner beneficial to all sectors of society which seek and use these important data—the public and the private sectors, the scientific community, and policymakers. Let us learn a lesson from the conclusions of the President's Task Force on Food Assistance. Our deficiency of information must be faced now, before the next round of concerns regarding hunger in America are ignored because, once again, this country lacks timely dietary and nutritional status data.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the forefront of rapid advancements in many areas

of science and information technology. It is time we focus these resources on nutrition monitoring and related research needs. I invite my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

The editorial from the San Bernardino Sun follows:

[From the San Bernardino Sun, Jan. 13, 1984]

HUNGER TASK FORCE DIDN'T GIVE MUCH TO CHEW ON

The report of the presidential task force on hunger is a profound disappointment—not so much because we disagree with its conclusions, but because its findings are so wishy-washy solid conclusions are hard to find.

The work of the panel is notable for what it lacks. There is little weight to its research.

One of its participants, Californian Sandra Smoley, president of the National Association of Counties, gave a telling, if unintentional, picture of the depth of the panel's work when she said, "We say there is definite hunger, no doubt about it. Due to our short period of time and the data available, we don't have any quantitative information about it."

Without "quantitative information" about a problem, it is difficult to make specific plans to cure it. We had hoped, if nothing else, that qualitative information would be exactly what the study would reveal.

The report is almost an exercise in tinkering.

For instance, it calls for no further cuts in federal food programs and recommends reinstatement of food-stamp funding that was cut 1 percent in October. True, those few extra dollars a month in food stamps may help families who have been running out of food while waiting for their next government aid checks to arrive, but that does not go far in solving fundamental problems of insuring the nation's citizens are adequately fed.

The report, in general, ignores inefficiencies of the food stamp program, although knowledgeable observers of food distribution programs have suggested the hungry might be better off if it was dismantled altogether and replaced by a more practical and proficient system.

It does not address the question of whether school-lunch subsidies ought to be restored to levels that existed before the current administration took office.

There are a number of important areas that are not dealt with in any substantial way by the panel. That offers no help to those who have to try to apply concrete solutions to the issues involved.

Even the major substantive recommendation from the panel runs around, rather than confronts, hard issues.

The task force urged Congress to make participation in existing federal food assistance programs optional for the states. States which choose to establish autonomous programs will instead receive one single appropriation—a "block grant"—to fund these programs.

That suggestion in itself opens more questions than it resolves.

Would poorer states—where presumably hunger would most likely be most acute—be able to respond swiftly and with flexibility to the problem?

Would federal money going to the states under such a system rise along with unemployment and food prices?

Altogether, the task force effort is perfunctory. It is more of a prelude for discussion than substance for discussion. We hope the food the government distributes is more nourishing to the stomach than the panel's report has been to the mind. ●

FRANK KARASTI, ATOMIC VETERAN, ANSWERS LAST ROLL-CALL

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, in 1979, I first heard from Frank Karasti, a veteran from my district who participated in the Able and Baker tests of Operation Crossroads while serving on the U.S.S. *Clamp*, ARS-33. For years prior to 1979, he had suffered from health problems related to excess radiation exposure. "Not big things," he wrote, "but enough so as to be slightly worried as my research definitely indicated they were associated with radiation exposure."

The Navy disputed the likelihood that he had been overexposed. Frank questioned the accuracy and completeness of Navy records. How, he asked, could the Navy rely on the accuracy of dosimeters worn by only a few participants as evidence that all members of a ship's company received only low levels of radiation?

He sought copies of the ship's log and his own medical records. He attempted to obtain from the Navy the current addresses of men with whom he served and when he was unsuccessful in that effort, he sought the help of the National Association of Atomic Veterans as well as other veterans' service organizations. He tried in every way he could to learn more about the risks associated with atomic radiation and the fate of other participants.

A year ago he reported that he had located five former shipmates. One was well; one had leukemia, and two were dead. He himself was now seriously ill. Was this morbidity/mortality finding representative of all those who took part in the testing of nuclear weapons? His effort to learn the answer to that question intensified as his time was running out.

Last month, I reported to Frank on the legislation before us today and, in reply, received a letter written December 27. He expressed concern for his shipmates who would be excluded by the 20-year limitation and for his wife and son, who would be left destitute. At the same time, he recognized that H.R. 1961 was an important first step. "As to the Relief Act," he wrote "I'll say we all have to go for it as the best we're going to get at this time." He concluded, "The Lord knows I can't be

hurt anymore, but there are the others to consider."

Nine days later, on January 5, 1984, he was dead.

In recognition that we still know so little about the long-term effects of radiation as well as chemical defoliants, and in memory of this veteran and the thousands more like him who were exposed to unknown risks, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1961.

I include at this point in the RECORD a tribute to Frank Karasti, the determined, unselfish, heroic, atomic veteran who spent the last years of his life in service to other atomic veterans.

[From the Ely Echo, Jan. 9, 1984]

ATOMIC VETERAN KARASTI ANSWERS LAST
ROLLCALL
(By Bob Cary)

The old sailor, Frank Karasti, finally came into his last port, Friday.

Frank, who lived in Winton, was one of the 42,000 servicemen who was exposed to atomic blasts during tests on Marshall Islands, July 1946. Frank, who had battled a lot of illness during the last years of his life, was sure that his problems began with exposure to the atomic blasts.

He was very active in the National Association of Atomic Veterans (NAAV) composed of survivors of atomic tests. By the time testing ended for "Operation Crossroads", the name assigned to the project, more than 200,000 military and naval personnel had been involved and about 200 ships. Karasti was sent aboard the damaged destroyer Hughes with two other men immediately after an experimental atomic blast in an attempt to keep the Hughes afloat. Karasti said all three got violently ill. Scientific measurements showed dangerous levels of radiation aboard the Hughes and other ships in the area. No one wore protective clothing.

It was a story long buried until veterans like Frank Karasti forced the U.S. government to reveal records from the tests. Only within the last few years has the government conceded something may have happened to the men. Recently, the Veterans' Administration opened radiation centers at the VA hospitals. For most of the veterans, whatever might have been done has come too late.

Born April 15, 1922, in Winton, he attended the public schools and at age 17 tried to join the Navy. His father finally signed the papers, in 1942, and at age 20 he joined. His father had been a logger until the lumber mills in Winton closed, then went to work in the mines. After discharge from the service, Frank worked in the mines, then in construction. He was an excellent carpenter and cabinet maker like his father and his brother Alan.

Frank married the former Dolores LeVander. Their reception was in the old Finn Hall in Winton, which was later sold and moved to Olson Bay where it is part of the present Olson Bay Resort. They had one daughter, Susan (Mrs. Rudy) Scufsa and sons John, Frank, Jeff and Todd.

It was while working in construction that Frank first became aware of the radiation problem. He was injured and his injury did not heal properly. Doctors told him that the symptoms were those of a person who had received radiation.

Thus began his odyssey into the atomic tests, a matter which had been classified

and buried under numerous layers of government bureaucracy. Along with other men who suffered disabilities and believed them service connected, he researched people involved, dug into old records and said he had even, at one point, been threatened by federal officers for revealing classified information. Eventually, the story came out and the veterans began getting Congressional support. Rep. James Oberstar was particularly active, using Frank as a prime source of information on the issue.

Frank Karasti died recognizing he would never benefit from the information he and the NAAV dug up and made public . . . but he felt it might help others so afflicted and might also make the general public aware of the terrible results of atomic testing and atomic weapons. ●

NATIONAL BLUEGRASS BANJO
CHAMPION MIKE SNIDER

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a young man in my congressional district who has won national acclaim for his talent with a musical instrument and with it an opportunity that thousands only dream about. The young man's name is Mike Snider.

Last September, Mike won the National Bluegrass Banjo Championship. Just a few weeks ago, he was invited to appear on the stage at the Grand Ole Opry in Nashville and from all accounts, brought the house down with his performance. To make this occasion even more special, Mike brought 1,500 citizens from his hometown of Gleason, Tenn., with him. It was certainly an event enjoyed by Mike, his wife Sabrina, and those from his hometown who traveled to Nashville to witness it.

I would like to insert in today's RECORD, a newspaper clipping from the Jackson Sun on Mike's performance. He is certainly a credit to himself, his family, and his hometown. I share their pride in what he has accomplished through hard work and determination.

HOLLERIN' HOMEFOLK EASE OPRY DEBUT FOR
BANJO PICKER
(By Richard Crowson)

There must have been a few travelers on Interstate 40 Saturday who noticed all of the traffic and asked themselves what was going on.

If they happened to pick up on the fact that all those cars had the same "32" prefix on their license plates, they might have wondered what sort of calamity could lead to the evacuation of an entire county.

What was going on was this: The people of an entire West Tennessee town, Gleason to be exact, were transported from Weakley County to the balcony of the Opry House in Nashville, where they whooped and hollered for a banjo-picker who walked out on that stage, took aim with his banjo and fired sev-

eral hundred rounds of crackling banjo notes straight at them. And unlike any other firing squad victims in history, those folks grinned and clapped and begged for more.

Mike Snider was making his first appearance on the Grand Ole Opry. The 23-year-old Gleason resident is a farmer and hog-feed salesman who won the National Bluegrass Banjo Championship in Winfield, Kans., in September. A lot of banjo contests are held around the country, but every banjo player who's worth his "Salty Dog" knows that Winfield is the one that counts.

Gordon Stoker of the Jordanaires first bragged about Snider to Opry manager Hal Durham, who, after receiving a slew of letters from Snider's hometown supporters, in an unprecedented move, sent 1,500 free tickets to Gleason. Gleason responded, well, Gleefully.

Roy Acuff, who introduced Snider during his portion of the show, had this to say before going on stage: "Most boys who win those sort of contests come on home and folks don't think much about it. But somehow or other the people of Gleason down there have taken an interest in him. I've never seen nothing like it! They must think a lot of him. If he was a boy with bad streaks in him, I don't think the people of Gleason would come back him up like that."

Snider's "streaks" were evident on the Opry stage, however, as his fingers streaked all over his banjo. Accompanied by Jackson's Ronnie Owen on bass and guitarist Fred Duggin, Snider played "Shucking the Corn" and "The Bells of St. Mary's."

A barrage of media people backstage gave Snider's "Aw shucks" personality a constant testing, and the results were always the same.

"Is all this for me?" he asked when he arrived at dressing room No. 1, the Acuff dressing room, and saw the cameras, note pads and microphones straining in his direction. "Good gracious!"

Opry star Boxcar Willie was introduced to Snider the night before when Snider appeared on The Nashville Network's "Nashville Now" program. To put it mildly, Willie was favorably impressed. "He's got the 'gen-you-wine' thing: Talent. And the personality to go with it. He reminds me of a young Grandpa Jones with his talking and all."

Minutes before he began his show, Acuff predicted that Snider might be a touch on the queasy side. "He'll be nervous up there tonight. I've never seen a person go on the Opry for the first time that wasn't very nervous." But Acuff had never seen a Nutrena Hog Feed salesman named Mike Snider before.

Asked while he waited in the wings of the stage of the "Mother Church of Country Music" if he wasn't a little nervous, Snider grinned and peeked toward the audience and said, "Naw, I'm not. It just looks like home out there."

But is it possible that Snider was putting everybody on? If a person could learn the intricacies of three-finger style banjo picking, couldn't he also teach himself how to grin and nod and talk like a "young Grandpa Jones"?

Not this fellow, according to the folks in the balcony. "He's just country and down-to-earth," said Danny McElhiney of Gleason. His wife, Sandra, declared, "What you see with Mike is exactly what you get."

And what you hear from Snider is exactly what seven years of dedication to an instrument and a lot of talent can produce. Of course, it wasn't always so, according to

John Snider, Mike's brother. John recalled some of the years of practice with a laugh and admitted, "He nearly drove me crazy!" But those years were gone by the time Snider was married, said his wife, Sabrina. "Now I just get to hear all the good stuff," she says.

So Mike Snider came to Nashville and played his banjo on the Grand Ole Opry stage. The bright spotlights glistened off the white top of his banjo as the sun had gleamed off the snow-covered soybean fields along the interstate on this cold, clear January Saturday. And when Snider reflected on what he had been through, he drawled, "I'm tickled. I don't know what'll come of it. If nothing does, well that's fine. I had a great time!"

OUTSTANDING SUPPORT FOR THE TALENTED TEACHERS ACT OF 1983

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, last November, Chairman PAUL SIMON, Congressman BILL GOODLING, Congressman E. THOMAS COLEMAN, and I introduced the Talented Teachers Act of 1983.

Since that time, we have received a tremendous number of positive comments about the bill from education experts and others across the country. The Talented Teachers Act represents one positive way for the Federal Government to: Recognize the tremendous importance of teachers in America; encourage bright students to enter the profession, and keep talented teachers at the front of the classroom.

I would urge my colleagues to consider these comments and to support this modest, but effective initiative.

Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, writes:

As you know, my own commitment to the improvement of the teaching profession includes emphasis on ideas that connect closely with those emphasized in your legislation. I believe that Federal initiatives will be important and necessary in securing outstanding students for careers in teaching. And I agree that talented teachers must be recognized—for what they have done and for what they can do as role models for their peers.

Patricia Albjerg Graham, dean of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard University and member of the 20th Century Fund Task Force, comments:

You and your colleagues are to be congratulated for taking this important step, both in terms of addressing two of the more critical problems confronting education, and in terms of understanding what we on the 20th Century Fund Task Force considered the overriding Federal interest in their prompt and successful resolution.

I hope that this legislation continues to receive bipartisan support.

In testimony before the U.S. Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, Harvard President Derek Bok stated,

Among the possibilities, the following seem to represent the most promising ways for the Federal Government [to improve the quality of our schools is] to act in concert with universities:

"Offer scholarships or forgivable loans to highly talented undergraduates to prepare themselves as teachers, contingent on their actually serving for a stipulated period of years. Such initiatives would spend federal dollars efficiently by using them only for academically talented persons who will actually teach in the schools. . . .

"Fund sabbaticals . . . for a stipulated number of exceptional teachers who wish to attend a university for further study in their subjects or to prepare themselves as master teachers or as school administrators. Such sabbaticals, with a commitment to return to the public schools, could reward and renew able teachers and this help to retain those whose services are most needed."

The Sacramento Bee and the Fresno Bee, two California newspapers, in January editorials, wrote,

With a shelf-full of recent reports bemoaning the state of American education, the topic has become political excitement. But thus far precious few good ideas have emerged . . . Now comes a modest sensible proposal for Federal aid in one area where it can do some good: enticing able college students into teaching careers. . . .

Not even generous scholarships will turn these recruits into career teachers however. That will require higher salaries, better working conditions, and a commitment to excellence on the part of the schools. But at \$75 million, this measure is a blue-chip investment in education.

In October, the Washington Post wrote in an editorial that:

The Simon task force knows that large new Federal appropriations for school aid are not likely. Nor, since they mean Federal control of the public schools, are they desirable. Instead, the task force offers two modest but valuable suggestions. How about Federal support for summer institutes to help classroom teachers improve their capabilities? Even better, how about Federal scholarships to draw unusually able students into teaching? At a time when great numbers of good students are having trouble financing college education, the idea of trading tuition aid for public service becomes increasingly appealing.

Writes Dr. Anne Flowers of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education,

I agree that attracting capable young students into teaching and acknowledging the achievements of outstanding educational professionals are important priorities for all levels of government.

State Senator Robert Martin of Kentucky writes,

You have proposed legislation on two problems which I think are pertinent to the improvement of the quality of education, namely, the recruitment and retention of excellent teachers. The legislation which you have proposed attacks these two problems and I think should be considered by the Congress if it is serious about improving education.

Floretta McKenzie, Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools, says,

I believe the proposed legislation has real merit. Apart from the intrinsic value, the Act would support, in a very substantial way, teacher recruitment and professional development, both financially and philosophically.

Writes Glenn Watts, president of the Communications Workers of America and member of the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth:

I am also quite pleased about this legislation you are proposing for talented teachers. As you correctly cited, it was one of the recommendations of the task force [on Education for Economic Growth], and I think is a preferable form of reward for talented teachers over merit pay.

James Sanders, past president of the Illinois School Boards, writes:

I will contract as many people that I can concerning cosponsoring HR 4477 which I think is an excellent bill.

Writes Robert Wilburn, Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

Federal assistance for the ablest teacher candidates and the most talented classroom teachers will very positively complement our Scholars in Education and excellence in Teaching Awards. I commend you and the co-sponsoring Congressmen for taking steps to improve the quality of education and I strongly support your efforts.

Anna Harrison, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, writes:

Two comments: First, I applaud your action in this matter, and second, I hope that it receives favorable action.

Dean Robert Barr of the Oregon State University-Western Oregon State College School of Education, says,

I was delighted to learn that you have submitted the Talented Teachers Act of 1983 to Congress. Given my perception of the urgent needs of American education, this legislation would be an important contribution.

Writes Penny Williams, a member of the house of representatives in the State of Oklahoma:

The enactment of this bill should be a boon for the efforts to improve quality in education and to attract bright, lively people to the field of teaching . . . Once again, many thanks for the enormous contributions the passage of this bill should make in raising the level of literacy in America today.

Prof. Brewster Denny of the University of Washington and a member of the 20th Century Found Task Force, writes:

The bill certainly sounds to be a very fine step in the right direction and appears consistent with what we are trying to do. I hope that Congress will act on this legislation soon.●

SOVIET ARMS CONTROL VIOLATIONS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's report on Soviet arms control violations, which was recently sent to the Congress, is predicated upon the way in which arms treaties are checked for compliance. Verification, the process by which our country can tell if the Soviets are cheating in relation to the provisions of an arms control agreement, is the critical element of arms control and is an important issue within the context of arms reduction talks. Finding paths to mutual trust, based upon positive proof, is crucial to the future of any arms limitations, especially with such newer trends in weapons development as mobile missiles and delivery vehicles which can carry conventional explosives or nuclear warheads. In this regard, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the January 16, 1984, edition of *Aviation Week and Space Technology*.

SATELLITE INTELLIGENCE—AND ITS LIMITS

(By William H. Gregory)

An exotic and sensitive technology is shaping up as a sleeping issue with explosive potential in the 1984 U.S. elections. Specifically, the issue is reconnaissance satellite technology and capability—what the politicians and diplomats in both the U.S. and the USSR euphemistically call national technical means—and what they can do and what they cannot.

A good deal of hyperbole, and public relations flummery, has surrounded reconnaissance satellite imagery in the past. Claims that license plate numbers on a parked car could be resolved from orbital altitudes served an obvious political purpose in the era of Henry Kissinger, Jimmy Carter and the pursuit of detente. If the all-seeing eye in space could detect anything anywhere on the ground, or so the public was led to believe, it followed that an arms control agreement was safely verifiable.

Space photography is very good. The Skylab large format camera a decade ago, using a special film developed originally for space reconnaissance, gave the world a taste of what optics in orbit could do. The problem with this is satellites in being. The U.S. has just about run through its inventory of film-return satellites—the KH-8 and KH-9 series—and there are no more in production. No program is in place to build any more.

RELIANCE ON DIGITAL SYSTEM

Now the U.S. is relying on the KH-11 and its digital imagery, a system whose cover was blown unequivocally in the late 1970s when a Central Intelligence Agency clerk sold a user manual to the Soviets. What was not revealed at that time was that a massive overrun of almost \$1 billion had induced the National Reconnaissance Organization to strip away the funds from film-return satellites and put the money into the KH-11 to keep that program alive. Overruns continue to plague follow-on development.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

KH-11 imagery has the advantage of availability in near real time. Sometimes the imagery is good and sometimes is not so good. While the U.S. has been playing balance-the-books with its reconnaissance satellite program, the Soviets have been sharpening their classic skills in building Potemkin villages. They are using concealment. They are using decoys. Simplest of all, they are operating at night when digital or optical imagery is out of business.

Irrespective of how good or bad satellite imagery is, there is the matter of coverage. If the satellite is not in the right place at the right time, high resolution is academic. The numbers of reconnaissance satellites the U.S. is flying now are not nearly enough to verify an arms control treaty with a nation that has a special high-priority department to mastermind concealment.

There is a parallel between prospecting for intelligence by satellite and prospecting for mineral wealth by satellite. Both have their strong points, as in covering vast amounts of territory to find targets of interest. Ground truth for confirmation and detail is essential. Complete dependence on any one information-gathering technique is a delusion.

How this figures in the 1984 election is with the issue of peace. The Democratic opponent of President Reagan will obviously have a big peace plank in his platform. Pressures from within the White House also exist for the President to don a toga of peace of his own. The climate is ideal to encourage the U.S. to abandon its tough stance on a new arms control agreement and settle for what it can get for a piece of paper to waive on the hustings.

PLAYING CATCHUP

When the President took office, he virtually ignored arms control. That was a political error. He lost the peace initiative to the Russians. He regained lost ground by beginning the START talks, by making proposals. Neither the Soviets nor the United States had any real ideas on where to go next with arms control as the talks wore on, but good intentions were being demonstrated. Then the Soviets made the mistake of breaking off negotiations because of cruise missile and Pershing 2 deployment. Now the U.S. can take the initiative.

With the onus on the Soviets for walking away from the conference table, the Administration has the opportunity to lay the truth on the line with the public. An arms control agreement must be verifiable. Verification solely by the satellite system the U.S. has in being is not possible. The Eisenhower Administration plumped for open skies and on-site inspection in the 1950s, and the Soviets have never accepted the latter. Why the Soviets have never done so is lost in arms control noise.

Ten years of SALT treaties have bought the Soviets valuable time that they have used to develop their arsenal. They are now at the point of kicking over the Antballistic Missile Treaty, as *Aviation Week & Space Technology* senior military editor Clarence A. Robinson, Jr., reports in this issue (p. 14).

The Administration itself is beginning to lay out the dimensions of the problem piecemeal. An opportunity is emerging for the President to organize the impending eruption, to level with his constituents about what has to be done to clean up the reconnaissance satellite mess, to lay on the line the broader elements in what the quest for peace with security is all about and what has to be done technically, strategically and politically to get there.●

PUBLIC HOUSING

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1984, the *Washington Post* printed a page 1 article highlighting the troubles of the Nation's public housing program. Unfortunately, the article failed to recognize some of the successes that the program has experienced. Further, the article seemed to place all the blame on local housing authorities and not on the often inadequate and continuously changing Federal policies. Overall, the story perpetuated the myth that all public housing is badly managed and left the reader with the impression that public housing developments cannot work.

Robert Maffin, the executive director of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials has a different and more accurate perception of the Nation's public housing stock. I would like to enter his letter to the *Post* in an attempt to correct some of these misleading impressions.

NAHRO
January 3, 1984.

Ms. MEG GREENFIELD,
Editor, Editorial Page, the *Washington Post*,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Ms. GREENFIELD: As Executive Director of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials, I read with great interest the January 3 article by Howard Kurtz, "Red Ink Plagues Public Housing, Poor Management, Maintenance by Local Agencies Cited by HUD".

Unfortunately, the article places the blame for the financial troubles of public housing primarily on mismanagement by local housing authorities. The overall thrust of the article and the headline give new currency to the popular myth that most of the nation's public housing consists of poorly managed, deteriorating, largely vacant and crime ridden developments. I take serious issue with this view.

Certainly, as in my large enterprise, there are some isolated examples of mismanagement, but the well documented facts are that most of the nation's more than 2,700 public housing authorities are well managed, most public housing is in sound condition and most public housing developments are fully occupied with substantial waiting lists of eligible prospective tenants eager to move in as vacancies occur.

It is true that many public housing authorities are financially troubled. But the primary reason is not the mismanagement by local housing officials.

Local housing authorities receive their operating funds from a combination of rental income from tenants and federal subsidies. For many years federal law limited tenant rents to 25 percent of the tenant's adjusted gross income. For more than a decade operating costs far outstripped increases in rental income. Utility costs, for example, have increased by more than 400 percent over a 10 year period. Overall operating costs have almost tripled while rental income increased less than 50 percent. Even as the rent that could be charged was being

increased to 30 percent of gross adjusted income, slashes in CETA jobs, various income maintenance and social service programs, and the worst recession in more than 40 years resulted in decreased incomes for many public housing tenants and thus decreased rental income for local housing authorities.

If public housing is viewed as a partnership of local and federal governments it is clear that the federal partner has not fulfilled its obligation. There has been persistent underestimation of inflation and utility costs by HUD and subsequent underfunding of daily operating costs. The utility cost inflation factor used in 1980, for example, was 13 percent while reality was 28 percent. The ability of local public housing managers to plan and manage efficiently has thus been adversely affected by a consistent pattern of inadequate federal operating subsidies and last minute supplemental funding.

As public housing authorities were forced to use their reserve funds to meet urgent operating expenses, the list of deferred maintenance items grew creating an immediate problem of deteriorating units. The basic problem has not been local mismanagement.

Even HUD Secretary Samuel R. Pierce, Jr. has publicly recognized that most public housing is well managed. In a speech at NAHRO's Annual Convention in San Diego on October 10, 1983, Secretary Pierce said:

"The general public hears little about public housing that is not sensational in nature. But I know a little about your achievements. I'm fully aware of the good job you've done and continue to do. Yet, most people are unaware that 90 percent of our country's public housing is well-run and a valuable resource to the communities and low income families you serve. I think you and every American can be proud that most public housing is relatively trouble free, the kind of housing which people generally accept with little notice."

That public housing has been successful is obvious from the record, however much that record may be ignored or distorted. Public housing provides decent, safe housing for more than 3.4 million low income Americans. As Dr. Eugene J. Meehan, Professor of Political Science and a Fellow of the Center for Metropolitan Studies, University of Missouri at St. Louis, has observed, "Properly designed and managed, public housing offers the cheapest, most flexible, and most productive form of housing assistance known."

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. MAFFIN,
Executive Director. ●

OPPOSITION TO THE AGRICULTURE PRODUCTIVITY ACT OF 1983 WITHIN THE AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY

HON. JOE SKEEN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate last week over the Weaver organic farming bill, I regret that the opposition of certain farm organizations was not documented for the record.

Below are letters from American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Pork Producers Council:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1984.

Hon. JOE SKEEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SKEEN: The American Farm Bureau Federation is a general farm organization in 48 States and Puerto Rico. Farm Bureau membership exceeds three million member families. Virtually the entire spectrum of agricultural production and production techniques is reflected in Farm Bureau membership. We oppose H.R. 2714, the "Agricultural Productivity Act of 1983."

We believe that this legislation is poorly drafted, misstates the current situation and would urge farmers in a direction that would be counterproductive to agriculture, consumers, and the country as a whole. This bill asserts that we are currently engaged in "chemical intensive" methods of farming and infers that it would be desirable if producers were to shift to organic farming methods. There are highly diversified methods of production for food and fiber in this country tailored in each instance to the individual producer's access to capital, labor, water, land, market, and various other factors that impact on production decisions.

In some regions of the country farmers use crop rotations, livestock waste and other methods that might be considered compatible with what this bill refers to as "organic farming." They are, in fact, traditional farming practices that have evolved as a result of producer experimentation and decision based on their best experience and judgment. In other parts of the country, due to unique circumstances of soil, water, topography and market access, producers have become more specialized in the kinds of commodities they produce. We will oppose efforts to superimpose Washington wisdom over these locally determined production decisions.

In 1980, the Department of Agriculture released a report and recommendations on organic farming. On pages 47 and 48 of that report the Department concluded that if 30 percent of the harvested corn and soybean acreage were converted to organic farming operations, corn and soybean prices would be increased 28 percent and 53 percent respectively. The price of oats and hay would come down significantly. Although no numbers were given, it was indicated the total agricultural exports would be lower and that consumer prices would be "significantly higher."

If enacted, this bill would authorize an expenditure of more than \$13 million over the five year life of the bill to promote an agricultural concept that is counterproductive to the long-term well-being of agriculture, the environment and the consumer. We urge opposition to the bill.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. DATT,
Secretary and Director,
Washington Office.

NATIONAL PORK PRODUCERS COUNCIL,
Des Moines, Iowa, January 25, 1984.

Hon. JOE SKEEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SKEEN: Thank you for your letter relative to Bill H.R. 2714 and the report accompanying that Bill. The National Pork Producers Council (NPPC) is

pleased to have this opportunity to present our views on this legislation.

The Council agrees with the views expressed by you and your colleagues in the dissenting views which were published in the Committee report accompanying that Bill. We are also in agreement with the United States Department of Agriculture in regard to the research pertaining to a particular type of farming.

NPPC notes with particular interest a proposal to have pilot projects which would apply to animal production. We do not believe these are necessary or even desirable in that the growth regulators and feed additives which are utilized by livestock farmers are carefully regulated and controlled by the Food and Drug Administration. These livestock feed additives, drugs and growth regulators are useful not only to farmers who employ large-scale rearing practices, but also those who have less intensive livestock production practices.

We, therefore, wish to indicate our opposition to this legislation.

Sincerely,

C. DONALD VAN HOUWELING,
Consultant for Scientific and
Government Affairs.

The National Cattleman's Association also opposes this organic farming legislation:

The National Cattleman's Association cannot support the Agricultural Productivity Act of 1983. Our opposition is not directed toward "organic farming" per se since the choice of farming methods, whether "organic" or "conventional," must be left to the individual farmer or rancher. Our opposition is based on the fact that the research agencies affiliated with the USDA already have the authority to conduct research in this area. The act would only serve to legislate the design of the experiment and limit the statistical basis for drawing inferences. Further, this legislation "second guesses" the expertise of the researchers involved.

We believe that the "information study" required under the Act (otherwise known as a literature review), will show that this research has already been done many times over. This act would add to the number of combinations of production variables which have been studied, but this is of little value considering that the number of possible combinations is nearly infinite.

The use of the terms "organic" and "conventional" tends to exaggerate the differences between these methods of production. They are more alike than not and most producers use components of each "type" of system. Cattleman are not opposed to the development of new methods of production with greater emphasis on "organic" systems. However, we believe this research, if it has real merit, will be done in the normal course of scientific investigation.

The act would also include a study on "organic" animal production. The effects of the transition from the "conventional" animal production systems to "organic" animal production systems would be considered "conventional" as would nonprotein nitrogen supplementation (commonly used in ruminant feeding). These practices were developed through years of nutrition research and have been shown to be effective and safe. To compare a system which incorporates this knowledge to one which does not is not likely to advance the study of animal nutrition.

Additionally, the effect of the transition from the use of FDA-approved compounds

such as hormonally active growth promoters to the nonuse of these products would be studied. The results in this case seem totally predictable and, once again, will not likely enhance our knowledge of growth physiology. Evaluation of production systems which do not use various vaccines (vaccination is considered a conventional production tool), parasiticides and other animal health products is an endorsement of ignorance and is not likely to expand our knowledge of animal health science.

In final analysis, the "Agricultural Productivity Act of 1983" seems more closely aligned with rural sociology than with the advancement of agricultural science. The National Cattlemen's Association is not opposed to the study of rural sociology, but if that is the intent of the bill, it should be rewritten to reflect that. ●

CONGRESS' SPENDTHRIFT IMAGE IS A BAD RAP

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric has already begun to fly on where to cut the budget in fiscal year 1985. The administration in this election year will attempt to blame the Congress for the projected huge deficits in the 1980's and seek to further plunder social welfare programs.

We need to be reminded exactly where the money is going and where the growth in the budget is coming from so that we can answer the administration's charges. Professor Norman Ornstein, of Catholic University, has written an excellent article providing us with the ammunition to answer the President.

Although the text of the article is reprinted below, I would like to highlight a few of the points he makes.

First, there are three causes of future growth in Government spending: Defense, by far the lion's share; debt interest, and social security and medicare.

In point of fact defense is to grow by \$97.6 billion, or 63 percent of the total growth between 1983 and 1988. Let us remember that we have the President to thank for this astronomical growth of the defense budget.

On the other hand, the debt interest cannot be tinkered with. And Congress has acted responsibly to index social security benefits and control medical costs. In 1981 the Congress reduced medicare costs by more than \$13 billion and billions more will be saved by the prospective reimbursement system.

Second, Congress has directly and greatly reduced the areas where Congressmen could use spending to their individual advantage. Thus contrary to the conventional image of wild pork barrel spending by the Congress, Professor Ornstein demonstrates that Congress by 1986 will have discretion

over only 6.6 percent of domestic spending.

The bottom line is that Congress has been "remarkably disciplined" in its spending.

On the revenue raising side of the ledger, again the Congress has been more responsible than the administration. The administration has refused to close tax loopholes or raise taxes. I have, as chairman of the Select Revenue Measures Subcommittee, sought to close tax loopholes, end inequitable tax shelters and raise revenue by taxing the insurance industry and discriminatory and excessive fringe benefits. H.R. 4170, the Tax Reform Act, which contains several of these measures, will soon be before the House for a vote. I hope my colleagues will vote for this bill, which will send a message to the President and the American people that the Congress is serious about solving the unspeakable deficits.

Mr. Speaker, whether we are talking about cutting spending or raising revenue, the Congress has led the way.

The full text of Professor Ornstein's article follows for my colleagues' information:

THE MISERS OF CAPITOL HILL—CONGRESS' SPENDTHRIFT IMAGE IS A BAD RAP

(By Norman Ornstein)

It's fashionable to blame Congress and its irresponsible spending habits for all our current and future economic ills. We can expect plenty of that this election year, even though President Reagan chose not to do so directly in his State of the Union message Wednesday night. Why, even members of Congress line up to volunteer for the blame.

The public is easy to convince. Few images are as fixed in conventional wisdom as that of a Congress populated by profligate, irresponsible, pork-crazed individuals unwilling and unable to control wild domestic federal spending, bending to the whims of any and all special interests.

But there is a problem here: the conventional wisdom is wrong. As the numbers and the history show clearly, it is the critics—not Congress—who are irresponsible.

Of course, none of the critics has accused Congress of irresponsibly hiking defense spending. Indeed, President Reagan and like-minded commentators applaud the future budget increases in defense and want considerably more. The attack on Congress is all focused on the domestic side of the ledger. So let's examine the ledger, using administration figures. Table 1 gives budget outlays for 1980, 1983 and up-to-date projections for 1984 and 1988 in constant, 1983 billions of dollars (i.e., adjusted for inflation).

TABLE 1.—BUDGET OUTLAYS IN 1983 DOLLARS

| | 1980 | 1983 | 1984 | 1988 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Total outlays | 707.0 | 795.9 | 829.5 | 950.4 |
| Defense | 166.6 | 210.5 | 235.1 | 308.1 |
| Net interest | 64.7 | 87.7 | 100.5 | 120.1 |
| Social security and medicare | 182.9 | 22.4 | 229.3 | 267.0 |
| All other domestic | 293.2 | 275.4 | 264.6 | 255.3 |

There is, obviously, substantial growth built into these budget projections. But look where the growth is coming from. From 1983 to 1988, the total budget is to grow, in

constant dollars, by \$154.5 billion. Defense is to grow by \$97.6 billion, or 63 percent of the total growth. Interest on the debt is to grow by \$32.4 billion, or 21 percent of the total. Social Security and Medicare are to grow by \$44.6 billion, or 29 percent of the total.

That adds up to 113 percent—because all other domestic spending, everything but Social Security and Medicare, declines in constant dollars by \$20.1 billion.

In simple terms, then, there are three causes of future in government spending: defense, by far the largest; debt interest, and Social Security and Medicare. Congress has reined in the rest of domestic spending.

Our legislators may not have slashed the domestic government in half, but they have brought it to a virtual standstill. Given public attitudes and our system of government, that is noteworthy and praiseworthy.

But there's more. The overall attacks on Congress portray our legislators as greedy servants, both for selfish and conniving "special interests," and for their own parochial districts. There is more than a grain of truth to the description of members of Congress as brokers in pork barrel. Political scientist David Mayhew in his classic book, "Congress: The Electoral Connection," eloquently described the kinds of parochial, particularized benefits reelection-minded legislators would seek—and we regularly see them doing so on the House floor. But what is lost in the spectacle of members grubbing for dams, bridges and federal buildings is the fact that they are fighting over a steadily shrinking share of the budget—shrinking because Congress decided it should.

If we accept the conventional image of a profligate Capitol Hill, we would expect congressmen to have increased the share of pork barrel-type government programs in the past few years, and to have at least protected these beneficial programs for the future. The opposite is true.

By indexing first Social Security and then other entitlement programs, congressmen consciously reduced their ability to use federal budget dollars for reelection benefit and leverage. In future, as entitlements grow automatically, defense skyrockets and the interest on the national debt accumulates, the share of the budget devoted to the rest of government—which includes most of the items we think of as special interest or parochial pork—declines markedly. Table 2 shows the shares of the federal budget from 1966 to 1968.

TABLE 2.—PERCENT OF FEDERAL BUDGET OUTLAYS

| | 1966 | 1976 | 1981 | 1986 ¹ |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------|
| National defense | 40.7 | 24.5 | 24.3 | 35.8 |
| Benefit payments to individuals | 26.9 | 48.5 | 48.2 | 46.9 |
| Net interest | 7.0 | 7.3 | 10.5 | 10.7 |
| Grants to State and local governments | 6.2 | 10.4 | 8.3 | 4.3 |
| Other Federal operations | 19.2 | 9.3 | 8.7 | 2.3 |
| | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

¹ Projection based on president's 1983 budget.

Source: "The Reagan Experiment," John L. Palmer and Isabel Sawhill.

If we add together grants to state and local governments and other federal operations—the category which includes the programs that congressmen can boast about when they are running for reelection—we can see that, at the height of the Great Society, these comprise 25.3 percent of the budget. Entitlement indexing began in 1973; by 1976, other domestic spending was 19.7 percent of the budget. With the first Reagan year, it was down to 17 percent. By

1986, it is projected at 6.6 percent. By 1986, it is projected at 6.6 percent! The portion may, in the end, be greater than that, but it will still be substantially down from the 1960s and 1970s.

In other words, Congress has directly and greatly reduced the areas where congressmen could use spending to their individual advantage.

The largest reason for this, certainly, is the indexation of Social Security, and subsequently of other entitlement payments. Why did Congress make entitlement increases automatic? Was it to appease special interests? To add to the budget? To benefit the individual legislators? No, no and no.

In the years before indexation, Congress faced constant pressures from interest groups and public opinion to increase Social Security dramatically. It complied. Increases in 1969, 1971 and 1972 totaled 45 percent; the 1972 increase alone was 20 percent. These huge increases were double the increase in cost of living.

By voting on each individual increase, of course, members of Congress could take credit for it back home. Making the increase automatic removed that campaign benefit. But Congress did so to save money and to insulate the process from special interest pressure. Republicans joined Democrats in pushing for indexation (fulfilling, incidentally, a pledge made in the 1968 Republican platform). Legislators recognized that other entitlement programs would inevitably be indexed also, further undermining their opportunities to claim credit for voting new benefits to the voters. They went ahead anyway—to act responsibly.

It may be that entitlements should be deindexed, or that yearly increases should be reduced. That has been proposed—in Congress, not by the president. It may be that other domestic spending should be curbed still more. But I have seen few specific proposals from critics of Congress to reduce spending enough to make a real dent in the deficits, since this would mean cutting government in half, a prospect very few Americans would stomach.

The fact is that Congress has been remarkably disciplined and relatively selfless in the past few years. The only courageous and specific proposals to cut the deficit in the future have come from Sen Bob Dole (R-Kan.) and others in Congress. Congressional critics want to deflect attention from themselves and from the very real need for a major tax increase in coming years. Congress deserves more credit than it has received, and more support for its future efforts at deficit reduction.●

ENGINEERING AND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, a responsibility of the National Science Foundation, from its inception, has been the Nation's health in engineering as well as in science. In light of today's critical challenge to the technical competitiveness and industrial leadership of the United States, the Foundation's policymaking body, the National Science Board, recently re-

viewed the engineering mission of NSF over the next decade.

The Board reiterated that the NSF has a vital role in support of academic engineering research and outlined areas where the Foundation should expand and alter its traditional role in support of engineering sciences at academic institutions. The Board stated that a close and mutually supportive linkage between the applications of engineering principles in industry and the research and teaching of our engineering schools should be encouraged by NSF policies.

As the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology begins its review of the National Science Foundation's fiscal year 1985 budget, I hope we will see in that document a reflection of the Board's several recommendations for a strengthened engineering program.

In the January 27, 1984 issue of Science, F. Karl Willenbrock, Cecil H. Green, professor of engineering at Southern Methodist University, underlines the importance of the National Science Foundation's efforts to strengthen engineering research and education. I would like to share this timely article with my colleagues:

ENGINEERING AND THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

In the scientific and technical communities of both the federal and private sectors, it is widely recognized that an effort to strengthen engineering at the National Science Foundation is desirable and timely. The engineering professional societies and engineering schools have been dissatisfied with NSF programs for many years. The engineering academic community has not found NSF to be an effective source of assistance as undergraduate enrollments have expanded while out-of-date laboratory facilities and inadequate research funding have decreased the ability of the schools to attract an adequate number of faculty members or full-time graduate students.

The organizational position of engineering within the NSF administration has been improving. Engineering has emerged from a division status, to part of a Directorate of Engineering and Applied Science, to its present position as a separate directorate. Presumably engineering is no longer considered as one of the sciences or simply the application of science but rather an enterprise with distinctive characteristics of its own.

One of these characteristics is the concentration of activities in industry. More than three-quarters of the engineers in the United States are employed in industry; industrial laboratories have done the outstanding research in many fields. Since much engineering research is best carried out by teams of specialists and is frequently heavily dependent on equipment, an industrial site may often be better adapted for effective engineering research than the usual academic environment.

Although in-depth skills in scientific and mathematical analysis are needed by both scientists and engineers, an engineer must also be able to synthesize knowledge into products and systems. Their designs must satisfy scientific as well as nonscientific criteria such as manufacturability, maintain-

ability, risk-minimization, and cost-effectiveness.

There are also distinctions in the academic world. Most engineers complete their formal education in 4-year undergraduate programs; such programs cannot be directed simply to preparation for graduate work. Postdoctoral fellowships, which are so important in the training of research scientists, are almost nonexistent among engineers.

Such differences between engineering and the sciences might lead one to the conclusion that engineering should be responsibility of a federal agency other than NSF. Some countries have developed separate university systems for engineering and scientific education, but in the United States nearly all research universities have strong scientific and mathematical programs as well as schools of engineering. Thus the U.S. academic structure provides a rationale for expanding NSF activities in engineering rather than assigning the general support of engineering research and education to other agencies.

However, of even greater importance is the fact that the scientific and engineering enterprises operate most effectively when their borders are kept indistinct. Increases of scientific knowledge and understanding have given great impetus to engineering and technological advances. In turn, engineering and technological advances have frequently led to expansion of scientific knowledge. The interplay of research and technology, which is crucial to the rapid advance of both research and engineering, should not be hampered by institutional barriers.

If engineering in NSF is strengthened, three objectives can be simultaneously served. First, badly needed assistance to the academic engineering community can be more efficiently provided; second, the synergism between science and engineering can be reinforced; and third, the nation's technological capacity can be strengthened. A dynamic engineering program at NSF is one of the most highly leveraged investments in the nation's technological future that the federal government can make.—F. Karl Willenbrock, Cecil H. Green Professor of Engineering, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas 75275.●

WOMEN STILL HAVE FAR TO GO TO REACH EQUALITY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, in the winter issue of Tuck Today, Prof. Mary Munter, of the Tuck School at Dartmouth, reviews several publications on the progress of women and concludes that although women have inched forward toward equality, there really is a long way yet to go.

Part of my disappointment with the defeat of the ERA last session related to criticism that the ERA is not needed; that women had already attained equality in nearly every arena.

The article printed below provides evidence that the ERA and other measures to promote gender-based equality are still necessary. While

some progress has been made, there is substantial evidence that women do not have the same opportunities as do men. The article follows:

American Couples: Money Work Sex, Philip Blumstein and Pepper Schwartz, New York: William Morrow and Company, 1983; "Women on Fortune 500 Boards" by Lloyd Elgart, California Management Review, Summer 1983; "Careers of Women, Minority, White Male MBAs" by Thomas Harrell and Margaret Harrell, Research Paper No. 558, Stanford Graduate School of Business, Summer 1980; Census Report, United States Government, Fall 1983—Reviewed by Professor Mary Munter.

You look around Tuck. The class of 1985 includes 24 percent women, compared to 0 percent in classes before 1970. Four women faculty teach here this year, compared to none before 1972. The number-one ranked graduating student for three of the past five years has been a woman.

You notice changes when you observe people in places like airports, supermarkets, and dinner parties. Men seem to be more involved with caring for their children and with doing household chores.

You hear success stories of women at the top, women now making executive decisions. ARCO treasurer Camron Cooper and American Express Vice President Joan Spero, for example, spoke at Tuck last year. Three members of the Tuck Board of Overseers are women.

These observations reflect some important changes. But are these observations representative of trends or merely aberrations? Are women, indeed, working more, earning more, achieving more, finding more equality, making more high-level decisions? Four recent statistical surveys address these kinds of questions: a Census Bureau report, a sociological book, a research project, and a management review article.

First, let's look at the latest government statistics. According to the Census Bureau report issued in the fall of 1983, more women than ever now work outside the home. Only one-third of all women worked in 1950; today, more than half do. Since the population has grown at the same time, the total number of working women has increased from 16.7 million in 1950 to 45.6 million today. Although growth rates are up, however, the pay rates are down. In 1950, white females earned 65¢ for every dollar paid to white males; today they only make 59¢.

The Census Bureau only gives us the salary figures. A sociological study, *American Couples*, looks at the implications of earning power. (It also looks at a lot of other things, such as the differences between hetero- and homosexual couples.) On the basis of years of study, 12,000 questionnaires, and 300 interviews, the authors have come up with a 650-page tome. The tome includes too much data (about half of the book is simply transcribed interviews and graphs) and to few startling findings (for example, they conclude "the quality and quantity of sex are important to the well-being of a relationship").

Other findings in the Blumstein and Schwartz study, however, reveal attitudes toward men's higher earning power that many of us might find surprising. In the first section, on "Money," for example, the authors conclude: "Money establishes the balance of power in relationships . . . the amount of money a person earns—in comparison with a partner's income—establishes relative power. This seems a rather cynical

finding, one that does not accord well with cherished American beliefs about fairness and how people acquire influence in romantic relationships. Most people . . . do not like to think that income, something that comes into the relationship from the outside, imposes a hierarchy of the couple. But it does."

Therefore, as they state seventy pages later in the section on "Work": "Because working wives bring money into the household, their work helps equalize the balance of power in their marriages. Their work also brings them greater respect from their husbands."

Even though working may bring more power and respect, "working wives still bear almost all the responsibility for housework. . . . Even if a husband is unemployed, he does much less housework than a wife who puts in a forty-hour week. This is the case even among couples who profess egalitarian social ideas, including equal sharing of all the work that has to be done in the house . . . when they broke it down to time actually spent and chores actually done, the idea of shared responsibility turned out to be a myth." A related finding revealed that "men feel that a successful partner should not have to do housework. . . . We feel that men tend to judge people, including their partners, by what they accomplish in the work world. They evaluate the importance of a person's time by its market value."

A final example of a conclusion that shows relationship inequality is based on marketplace inequality comes from the section on "Sex": "Men are less possessive than women because they are more powerful. When we asked people how troubled they would be if their partners had sex with someone else, we were surprised to learn that women are a bit more possessive than men. . . . We think heterosexual women are more possessive than men because they are more vulnerable and financially dependent. Even after the gains of the women's movement, it is still difficult for the average American woman to earn as much money as a man or to see herself as an independent force in the world."

So. The Census Bureau tells us women earn less. Blumstein and Schwartz tell us women lack equality in relationships because they earn less. But many people argue that women earn less in general mainly because of the influx of women at the bottom of the pay-scale who bring down the average for women like, say, Tuck MBAs.

Harrell and Harrell's study of MBA careers belies that argument. This 25-page research paper tracks the careers of about 350 MBAs from the Stanford classes of 1973, 1974, and 1975. For each year, graduating men and women started at essentially the same pay; by 1978, white males earned significantly more than white females. For example, the class of 1973 median starting salaries were \$17,000 for men, \$16,000 for women. By 1978, the median salaries were \$37,440 for men (an increase of 120 percent), and \$30,300 for women (an increase of 89 percent).

Harrell and Harrell also touch on the correlation between earning power and relationship equality. "Marital status of females," they conclude, "seemed to be related to earnings and hours of work outside the home." For example, divorced, widowed, or separated women reported working 55 hours per week, about the same as the average for all men. Married women, however, reported 50.8 hours (compared to 55.2 for married men) and married women with chil-

dren reported 48.6 hours. In other words, married women work less, and married women with children work even less.

What this study shows for women MBAs, *American Couples* shows for women in general. "Women in relationships with men increasingly see employment as part of their self-image, although this does not yet include taking on the provider role. . . . They wish to work, but not as the primary support of the family. Further, while some women are 'work-centered,' it remains a minority. We think that most employed women continue to value their role as companion and caretaker. Women in the study seem to want respect for both roles and are seeking a way to perform them both successfully."

So much for equality in the workplace. So much for equality in the household. But how about those gains at much higher levels? In a recent *California Management Review* article, Elgart reports on his survey of the boards of directors of the Fortune 500 companies. He found 181 women directors out of 6,549—a total of 2.8 percent. According to Elgart: "the boards of directors of our major corporations were men's clubs in 1970, and that remains unchanged after a decade of the greatest and most concerted struggle for women's rights in social history. It is true that the ranks of female directors have grown—2.3 percent in ten years, an average of two-tenths of one percent per year—but, at this rate, it will take about 200 years for women to attain equal representation in top corporate boardrooms—in or about the year 2180."

What, then, do the surveys tell us? Women are working more, earning less, continuing to do most of the housework and childcare, and making very few top-level decisions. Perhaps, therefore, we should avoid feeling complacent. We should avoid generalizing either from laments about "reverse discrimination" or from success stories about the lucky few around us.

What can the surveys never tell us? They can never get across the importance of those lucky few. As cliched and uninspirational as terms such as "leader," "mentor," and "role-model" may sound, we must remember, as women, to aspire to excellence, and, as people, to aspire to fairness, if we hope to make it possible for our daughters to live in a more equal world than the one our sisters live in now. ●

GRANDPARENTS RIGHTS—AN ISSUE WHICH MUST NOT BE FORGOTTEN

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which ran on the front page of the January 27 New York Times entitled "Couple Wins Court Battle to See Grandson, 6." The article focuses on an issue of special importance to me—the rights of grandparents to visit grandchildren following a divorce or other form of marital dissolution involving the children's parents.

This particular article details the case of Mr. and Mrs. George Layton of Binghamton, N.Y., and the 2-year legal struggle they have been involved in to get visitation privileges with their 6-year-old grandchild Mark. As the Times observes:

The Layton case is the most recent example of how as the divorce rate and human longevity have increased, courts in New York State and elsewhere have had to grapple with the special bond between grandparent and grandchild.

On April 19 of last year, this House unanimously passed House Concurrent Resolution 45 which I authored expressing the sense of Congress that all 50 States should adopt a Uniform Grandparent Visitation Act. The resolution calls upon the National Conference on Commissioners of Uniform State Laws to develop a model law which could then be submitted to the States for ratification. The resolution grew out of hearings and an investigation which my Subcommittee on Human Services conducted into the problem. After we received an individual letter from two grandparents in New Jersey who encountered numerous problems gaining visitation, we found their problem was not isolated. We also learned that while 42 States do have laws providing grandparents with the right to petition a court for visitation, the laws vary widely. They differ in terms of what triggers the right to petition. The laws differ relative to what factors are used in awarding visitation. However the most severe problem deals with the lack of interstate enforceability of visitation orders.

House Concurrent Resolution 45 deals with the issue in the spirit of promoting uniformity of State laws. It recognizes as should any legislation in this area that the right to visitation should only be awarded when it is in the best interest of the child.

An identical resolution to mine, Senate Concurrent Resolution 40 is pending in the Senate and is awaiting final action. I urge prompt and favorable action for it is a genuine issue worthy of our concern and commitment. I contend that the unwarranted deprivation of visitation between grandparents and grandchildren is a form of intergenerational abuse which government and the legal community must form a partnership to combat.

The New York Times article follows:

COUPLE WINS COURT BATTLE TO SEE GRANDSON, 6

(By David Margolick)

BINGHAMTON, N.Y., Jan. 26.—On Sunday, George and Catherine Layton plan to pick up their 6-year-old grandson, Mark Foster, and take him to the nearby Oakdale Mall. They want to visit a toy store, watch the fountain, then cap off the afternoon at Burger King or the Friendly Ice Cream Shop.

For Mr. and Mrs. Layton, however, this is not just an ordinary weekend outing. It is

the first time they have been allowed to see their grandson in more than two years, and it marks the culmination of a bitter court battle that began shortly after Mark's parents were divorced.

Last week, the state's highest court ruled, over the objections of the boy's mother and adoptive father, that the Laytons had a right under state law to visit their grandson. In effect, the court granted the Laytons visiting rights no longer enjoyed by their son, Mark's natural father. The Layton case is the most recent example of how, as the divorce rate and human longevity have increased, courts in New York State and elsewhere have had to grapple with the special bond between grandparent and grandchild.

It is a bond that, while relatively new to the law, was captured long ago in an Italian adage the Laytons quoted in court papers.

"Si niente va bene, chiama nonno e nonna," it states. "If nothing else is going well, call your grandfather and grandmother."

According to Harry D. Krause, a family law expert at the University of Illinois Law School, at least 42 states, including New York, now have laws that protect the rights of grandparents in the event of a parent's death or divorce.

Under these statutes, family law authorities say, courts have held that the rights of grandparents and grandchildren can limit the autonomy traditionally given to parents in the rearing of children.

Put another way, the laws mark the legal system's growing commitment to the preservation of the extended family where it is in a child's best interests.

"We've had men's lib, women's lib, and now we have kid's lib," said Doris Jonas Freed, a New York lawyer and an authority on family law. "Even little children have rights that cannot be abrogated. They're not chattels anymore."

For the Laytons, who live here in Binghamton, only a few miles from their grandson, the decision means the end of years of anguish spent looking for "Marky" wherever they went and sending birthday cards that were never acknowledged. It is also a second chance of sorts.

"I worked my whole life to get where I am, and I didn't have very much time with my children," said Mr. Layton, 64, who will retire this year after 34 years at a nearby General Electric Company plant. "We got time on our hands now."

The Laytons' son, also named Mark, married Cheri-Gay LaFrance in March 1975. He was 18 at the time; she was 20. Two years later, their son, Mark Layton Jr., was born. The couple divorced in May 1978, with the mother retaining custody of the child. A year later, she married another Binghamton man, Roger Foster.

Even after the divorce, George and Catherine Layton continued to see their grandson every other weekend. The visits abruptly stopped, however, in September 1981, when Mr. and Mrs. Foster adopted the child, renamed him Mark Foster and forbade the grandparents from seeing him. The boy's natural father approved the move; Mr. and Mrs. Layton did not learn of it until afterward.

"It hit me like a bolt of lightning," Mrs. Layton said.

In the last three years, the Laytons have seen their grandson for only a few seconds. In December 1981, Mr. Layton saw him briefly when he tried, without success, to take him to the General Electric Christmas party. Several months later, Mrs. Layton

ran into the boy, with the Fosters, at the meat counter of a local supermarket. She says he waved to her before the Fosters whisked him out to the car.

Mr. and Mrs. Foster have declined to be interviewed.

In late 1981, the Laytons sued for visiting rights in Broome County Family Court. The Fosters resisted, arguing that the grandparents' relationship with Mark was too tenuous to justify the disruptive effect the visits would have, particularly since the Fosters did not want Mark to know that he had been adopted.

Early last year, Judge Daniel S. Dickinson Jr. ruled in favor of the Fosters. He called the proposed visits "an invasion of privacy and embarrassment to the natural as well as the adoptive parent."

The Laytons appealed, and the Appellate Division of the State Supreme Court reversed the ruling. Last week, the Court of Appeals, the state's highest court, unanimously upheld the appellate ruling, saying that the state's Domestic Relations Law intended "to continue the familiar relationship between grandparents of an adopted child and the child, provided that doing so is not contrary to the best interests of the child."

The Laytons are now preparing themselves for Mark's visit, retrieving all of his favorite pictures and toys.

"If he reaches for my hand, that will be great," said Mr. Layton. "But if I ask him to go with us and he says 'no,' I'm going to have a broken heart. Why should I make a little boy suffer?"

TAX LEGISLATION TO REFORM DAIRY POLICY

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to eliminate the investment tax credit for dairy farmers in years in which we also have a price support program or a paid diversion program for dairy products. It is time to remove the tax subsidies which encourage dairy herd expansion while our taxpayers are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to shore up the price of surplus milk.

Government dairy policy is crazy: at one end of the cow, we are feeding it tax subsidies to produce and, at the other end, we are trying to stop the flow of milk. One policy or the other may make sense—but both together do nothing but spill taxpayer dollars.

Since 1949, the Federal Government has guaranteed a price to dairy farmers for their surplus products. The price support program, initiated to assure an adequate supply of dairy products, has resulted in increased production. Obviously, a farmer who is guaranteed a price for all his surplus has no incentive to decrease production. In fact, production has exceeded demand for dairy products in every single year since the price support program began.

But this support program has been a big ticket item for taxpayers. The cost of supporting this sacred cow has been hundreds of millions of dollars each year. The estimated cost for the year 1982-83 alone is \$2.5 billion.

This fall, legislation was proposed to make substantial cuts in the price support programs. The proposal was not enacted. Instead, a new dairy program was created which kept intact most of the price support program and added a paid diversion program for dairy farmers. Since Congress, in its wisdom, chose to slow the flow of milk by diversion and support programs, we must change the tax laws which now promote expansion and increased production.

The tax code has clearly fattened up the dairy industry. Even with a surplus of 19.7 billion pounds of milk products, dairy farmers are still allowed an investment tax credit when they expand. Credits are allowed for investments in dairy cows, single purpose agriculture structures such as milking parlors, and all machinery and equipment necessary for the purpose of dairy farming. For example, 10 percent of the cost of a farm machine may be subtracted directly from the tax bill due in the year in which the machine was purchased. All these tax-inspired investments encourage the expansion of dairy farms. At a time when there are 1 million more cows than are needed to meet current demand, tax incentives to expand are absurd.

The dairy lobbyists would have us think that the ITC is needed to help the small family farmers struggling to make a living. Let us not be fooled by this argument. A credit is of no use to a farmer who owes no taxes since the credit is an amount subtracted from taxes owed. A credit for 10 percent of the cost of a milking parlor does not help the poor farmer or one who is just about breaking even—but the credit is great for agribusiness and outside investors with substantial non-farm income.

Congress can no longer ignore the inconsistencies in Government dairy policy. It is time to synchronize the Tax Code with the rest of our dairy policy. By eliminating the ITC when expansion is undesirable, my bill will bring us one step closer toward a coordinated Government policy on dairy farms.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 4701

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (a) of section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining section 38 property) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(11) DAIRY PROPERTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Dairy property shall not be treated as section 38 property if, during any part of the calendar year in which such

property is placed in service, a Federal dairy program is in effect.

“(B) DAIRY PROPERTY.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘dairy property’ means any property which—

“(i) is used by the taxpayer predominantly in the trade or business of dairy farming, or

“(ii) is leased by the taxpayer to another person for use predominantly in such a trade or business.

“(C) FEDERAL DAIRY PROGRAM.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘Federal dairy program’ means any program of the Federal Government—

“(i) which is operated primarily for the purpose of supporting the price which farmers receive for milk, or

“(ii) under which farmers are paid for reducing the quantity of milk marketed for commercial use.

“(D) TREATMENT OF CHANGE IN USE.—If any property is not dairy property when placed in service by the taxpayer but such property subsequently becomes dairy property in the hands of the taxpayer, for purposes of this paragraph, such property shall be treated as placed in service in the calendar year in which there is such change in use.”

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act in taxable years ending after such date.●

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD HARTZEL

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1984, the Hazleton Elks Lodge No. 200 will pay tribute to Harold Hartzel by honoring him as their “Elk of the Year.” This award represents outstanding achievement in one on which all of the Hazleton community takes pride.

Mr. Hartzel was exalted ruler of the Hazleton Elks in 1979 and 1980 and has been chairman of the youth committee and other committees of the local lodge. He is a graduate of Hazleton High School and served in the U.S. Army. He is currently employed as supervisor of Armour Handcrafts, Valmont Industrial Park. He is married to the former Joanne Orlando, R.N., and they have two daughters, Mrs. William Tarapchak, Hazleton, and Kim, who is a senior at Hazleton High School.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Mr. Hartzel's family and friends in paying tribute to this outstanding citizen.●

ECONOMIC DISTRESS

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, in these times of economic distress there are those who would have us look to numbers and forget the uncounted unemployed. The eloquent testimony of

Francesco Cantarella, vice president of A&S department store in Brooklyn, tell us more than mere numbers convey. The testimony was given on December 19, 1983, before the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy.

TESTIMONY OF FRANCESCO CANTARELLA

A&S is the ninth largest department store in the country. It maintains its flagship store and corporate headquarters in downtown Brooklyn and has 14 suburban branches in the New York, New Jersey and Philadelphia area. A&S is a division of Federated Department Stores, Inc. The chairman of the Subcommittee asked me to comment on interest rates, credit availability, employment opportunities and business activities within a five minute period.

Holding these hearings the week before Christmas provides its share of ironies. Many of the borough's residential streets and all of the commercial zones are brilliantly decked out with Christmas lights and decorations. But the glitter masks many of the harsh realities which are caused by flaws in Brooklyn's basic economic structure. I need but touch briefly on the institutionalization and growth of soup lines or the appearance of people waiting in the early morning chill for store fronts to open in hopes of receiving a handout of cheese, and a burdened social delivery system creaking under the weight of increased applicants.

Why should these developments be of concern to a department store? There are the traditional and historic humanitarian concern of an 118-year old institution for the economic viability of one of the communities it serves. Also, because a business can only be as viable as is the community it is a part of. What I am talking about is the Crisis of Christmas, 1983. My remarks reflect the deep concern of A&S' senior management.

I know that many of you from Washington are thoroughly familiar with unemployment statistics, probably because there are so many of them around. I'd like to describe them to you in terms which I hope can be easily understood in Washington, especially by those people there who take it as an article of faith that blacks and other American disadvantaged are lazy, don't want to work, and whose only ambition is to achieve yet another generation on welfare.

I'm talking about those folk who sneeringly equate the indignity of standing in the rain for a bowl of soup with copping a free meal.

I'm speaking of that seemingly all-pervasive mentality in Washington which was recently summed up by a high ranking Administration official who said that Scrooge was a victim of a bad press and that Cratchit was, in reality, well off.

I'd like to make it clear that those people who have piously expressed “concern” about hungry Americans and “shock” about a problem whose roots are only three and a half years old—malnutrition and hunger having been wiped out earlier. I'd like to make it clear to those people who believe that folks prefer to cheat to eat rather than work to earn.

To help make it clear, I'd like to take you back to 12:30 a.m. on the morning of October 17, 1983. The weather was mild as people began lining up on a street outside a door of an office A&S had established for interviewing and hiring Christmas help. By 2 a.m. 200 people were lined up outside the

locker doors of the employment office. As dawn began to break there were several hundred more—standing or stooping. There were no provisions for sitting or any toilet facilities. By 9:45 a.m., when the doors opened, there were close to 1,000 men, women and youths lining the sidewalks for more than a block and a half.

As A&S geared up to hire 80 people a day until the store reached its full complement of 1,200 temporary hires. No advertisements had been placed in newspapers. People heard about job possibilities by word of mouth. The only mention of our Christmas hiring had been a sign which had gone up only week before in our personnel office. The jobs pay \$3.35 an hour.

Who are these people?

I'll tell you who they are and I'll tell you what our interviewers told me about the people they spoke to.

Ninety percent of the 11,000 people who showed up during the hiring period were black.

A majority of them either had college degrees, were in college or had a high school degree.

A "substantial" number, said one interviewer, were well-dressed, had good communicative abilities, and many had previous sales or business experience.

It is definitely out of character for an employer to talk about an over-abundant supply of workers. But, when 11,000 show up for 1,200 jobs, we do not view it as an asset to our business or to the community in which we do business.

Do you want to know what really troubles us most deeply at A&S? It is what happens to those ten thousand people who came to us in hopes of work and who, despite their qualifications, despite their motivation, despite their job readiness and experience and who, despite their personal and family needs, did not get a job.

We'd like to know what answers or what concern they have in Washington about those individuals.

There is another myth I'll comment on. It's a myth about black youth in urban America . . . about black youth in Brooklyn. In all fairness, I must allow that I have heard similar myths about Hispanic and Chicano youth in other parts of the city and nation and about white and Oriental youth elsewhere.

It is the Potomac Notion that youth isn't motivated; they don't want to work; that they prefer ripping off the public; or sit back and pick up CETA checks; even though CETA checks have become a collector's item.

Here again, the experience of a group of Brooklyn businesses may be instructive. We have been running, for the last three years, a vocational exploration program called Career Opportunities for Brooklyn Youth, or COBY for short. Of the 1,300 disadvantaged young men and women who completed the program, more than 57% of the youth who were either drop-outs or push-outs have gone on to permanent jobs with participating firms.

We cannot tell you what has happened to the hundreds of others who applied for jobs with COBY but were turned down because there were no more jobs. And that troubles us deeply, too.

I hope that these examples will tell you something about the employment scene in Brooklyn today where the economic recovery is badly trailing the rest of the greater New York-New Jersey region. By contrast, we have jobs going begging in our stores in

Nassau, Suffolk counties on Long Island and in our New Jersey branches.

A&S has, as other businesses in Brooklyn have done, followed the Administration's admonitions of facing up to competition and running our business more efficiently and, at the same time, better serving the needs of the less fortunate.

We have initiated our own programs and are working in partnership with other firms, with the public and voluntary sectors and directly with the community to help improve the social and economic environment.

Yet, the missing partner is the Federal government whose cutbacks in domestic spending have forced, and are forcing, tremendous hardships on a very large segment of the borough's population, many of whose problems are not of their own making but a consequence of present and past national policies.

Brooklyn's recession-struck private sector cannot replace the safety net for the borough's disadvantaged either through added capital investment or through increased charitable contributions, despite the fact that such funds have been marginally increased. Both are totally inadequate given the magnitude of the problems here.

As I indicated at the beginning of my comments, it is the week before Christmas and there is no reason why, like every other living American, A&S shouldn't present Christmas wish list of its own to this body. We ask for:

Increased federal government assistance to small and minority business, through the Small Business Administration and the Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Corporation. Also increased supervision of compliance by defense contractors to award sub-contracts to minority contractors to fulfill affirmative action commitments.

Increased funding of the Job Training Partnership Act from its projected \$3.6 billion level, down from \$11 billion in 1980, so that disadvantaged youth might be better trained through Private Industry Council programs for new opportunities opening up in small businesses.

A commitment by members of Congress to block the anticipated \$8 billion cut to be proposed by the Administration in "non-military" spending from the fiscal year 1985 Federal Budget.

I hope that the members of this committee will see the inter-relationship between the items requested and how they tend to support each other while improving the social and economic fabric of this borough as well as that fabric in any other community in urban America afflicted with the problems we have discussed today.

As is the case with anyone who makes a Christmas wish list, we do so without any certainty that any of these wishes will be granted. And this Christmas, 1983 we are less certain than ever before. Even though we know that the crisis is here.

I understand that, as we are sitting here, President Reagan is proclaiming today as National Care and Share Day and is appealing for contributions of canned goods to food banks and soup kitchens. This is deeply touching. Especially in view of yesterday's front page story in the New York Times about the formidable obstacles blocking the distribution of surplus food stuffs to the needy.

We forgot to put canned goods on our Christmas gift list.

What we want in Brooklyn are jobs for 1984.

We want jobs for that large group of our citizens who want the dignity of work, who

want to maintain the respect of their families, who want to hold their heads up with pride before their neighbors and friends.

Brooklyn's business community, its political organizations, its voluntary sector, its churches and the residential community are working hard to bring jobs to the borough. But without well-developed, carefully planned and adequately funded domestic assistance programs by the federal government our efforts will but barely provide our citizens with what they need and with what they justifiably want. ●

H.R. 1961

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues have spoken in eloquent detail on H.R. 1961, the Agent Orange and Atomic Veterans Relief Act, as passed yesterday by the House of Representatives. This bill is a much-needed step in the right direction and I applaud the wisdom of the House's action, which I supported wholeheartedly. I applaud the chair, Congressman G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, and the other members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for their work in bringing this bill before the House. I compliment Congressman TOM DASCHLE, the chief sponsor of the bill, and Congressman APPLIGATE, the distinguished chair of the committee's Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance, for their outstanding work on the measure.

Nevertheless, we must remember that the bill is a narrowly drawn, modest bill of limited scope and duration. It will relieve the problems of some Vietnam veterans and some atomic veterans, but it will not reach the problems of many others similarly exposed to agent orange and atomic radiation. With the passage of this bill, we may have taken the edge off the crisis for some, but the fundamental problem still remains to be resolved for all.

As passed, H.R. 1961 does not go as far as the bill originally introduced by Congressman DASCHLE, which I was proud to cosponsor. Let us view the bill as passed for just what it is—one of the pebbles constructing the road to eventual justice for our veterans. We have a long way yet to go in building that road.

I recently returned from a week's stay in Vietnam where I investigated the effects of agent orange on the Vietnamese population and terrain. I met with physicians, research teams, and scientists who have been studying the effects from agent orange exposure. I am currently finalizing a report from the trip and will have it ready for release on Thursday, February 2, 1984. I believe that report will be

useful in the struggle we have yet ahead of us on this very important issue.●

THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE TREATY OF PARIS RATIFICATION

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, 1984 marks the 200th anniversary of the ratification of the Treaty of Paris, the treaty that ended the Revolutionary War. This past Thanksgiving Day, the chairman of the National Committee for the Bicentennial of the Treaty of Paris, Dr. Joan Challinor, gave an address entitled "The Will to Peace" at St. Paul's Cathedral in London. I commend Dr. Challinor's speech to my colleagues. Her call for a recognition of the talents necessary for the work of peace, and a rightful regard for the skills of international diplomacy in order to build a durable peace are particularly timely. Dr. Challinor's speech follows:

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE
BICENTENNIAL OF THE TREATY OF PARIS
THE WILL TO PEACE

We meet today to celebrate Thanksgiving, an American observance more than half a century older than this Cathedral. As we observe Thanksgiving Day, we reach back over three centuries and touch once again our English roots. Three hundred and sixty-two years ago, a small band of English men and women joined with six native Americans to thank God for their first harvest in the New World. The Pilgrims' thanksgiving was an act of faith; during the previous winter they had lost half their population through starvation and disease. Their Governor, William Bradford, described their plight: "all things" he wrote, "stared at them with a weather-beaten face." Yet by their courage and tenacity, they endured.

Courage and tenacity were also needed for the negotiations of the Treaty of Paris—the treaty whose bicentennial we celebrate today. This treaty ended the American Revolution, established our independence and settled our Western boundary on the Mississippi River. It brought about what John Adams termed "returning friendship" between Great Britain and the United States and what David Hartley, the British negotiator called a "reunion of all our ancient affections and common interests." The treaty, no matter how favorable to our fledgling nation, ushered in an era in which the United States had as little chance of survival as did the Pilgrims, huddled on Plymouth's shores. Not only did we survive, but we have been uncommonly blessed: our granaries are full to overflowing, our nation stretches from "sea to shining sea" and beyond, and our one-time adversary has become a close and staunch ally. Like the ancient psalmist, we can ask ourselves, "what shall I render to the Lord for all that he hath rendered to me?" Our response today should be to make our first and greatest peace treaty, and peace itself, the focus of our Thanksgiving.

We should, first of all, rescue the Treaty of Paris from its undeserved obscurity. The British diplomats, Richard Oswald and David Hartley, are all but forgotten. The American negotiators are remembered for other supposedly grander accomplishments: Benjamin Franklin as scientist, writer, inventor, John Adams as our second President, and John Jay as our Chief Justice. But the fortunes of the new nation may have turned more on what they accomplished at the negotiating table than on all their other attainments. Benjamin Franklin fully realized the importance of his diplomatic work, writing to David Hartley, "we have long been fellow labourers in the best of all works, the work of peace."

A recognition of the talents necessary for the work of peace, and a rightful regard for the skills of international diplomacy, seem a most appropriate commemoration of the Treaty of Paris at a time when the whole world cries out for reasonable talk to end an unthinkable threat to human survival. We can determine to move forward towards peace—to seek negotiation out of conflict. We should put negotiators on an equal footing with our martial heroes, and diplomats should take their place beside generals and admirals in our pantheon. Sir John Fretwell, the present British Ambassador to France, spoke eloquently at bicentennial ceremonies in summer 1983: "War, he said, "however just, whatever the heroism that it inspires, is destructive and often disastrous for victor and vanquished alike. The test of statesmanship is not only in the will to win but even more in the will to build a durable peace."

It is this will to build a durable peace that has been so often lacking in the past. We have waged war with singlemindedness, and then negotiated in a fragmented and often hesitant way. To achieve a lasting peace will take force and vigor. We must let the world know that we are now about the work of peace as we were once about the work of war. The same resourcefulness, endurance, and self-reliance which were once the hallmark of the British and American negotiators in 1783 must now inform our peacemaking. We must wage a peace that will make it possible for humanity to breathe freely instead of merely holding its breath; and we must construct a peace that will let our children grow old, and our old people die a natural death. This determination, born out of the commemoration of the treaty would pay due respect to the peacemakers of 1783 and the men and women who labor today to bring peace and reconciliation to deeply troubled parts of the globe.

The last hymn we will sing today will be "The Battle Hymn of the Republic." We must begin to hear the words of this stirring hymn with a new resolve. Indeed, we must "sing to the Lord a new song"—a song of peace strong enough to convert a call to arms into an exhortation for peace. The "watchfires of a hundred circling camps" must now guard a peacekeeping army; the "altar in the evening" must be an altar on which we pray for peace; the "trumpet that shall never call retreat" must stir us to greater efforts in resolving disputes without recourse to war; and if we must "die to make men free," let us remember that no man or woman can be truly free until they enjoy the blessings of peace.

As we begin to wage peace, we need courage for the agonizingly difficult task ahead. Let us take heart from Christ's words, "Blessed are the Peacemakers." And let us add to them for our own very dangerous

time, "and blessed be the work of peace—so help us God."●

IMPACT OF GM-TOYOTA VENTURE TO BE ADDRESSED IN HEARINGS

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 8 the Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation and Tourism of the House Energy and Commerce Committee will conduct a hearing on the future of the auto industry in light of the recent tentative FTC decision not to challenge a joint venture between General Motors and Toyota.

While the majority of the FTC apparently believes the joint venture will have a net positive impact, others are less optimistic. A succinct expression of some of these concerns appeared in a recent Miami Herald editorial which I am inserting in the RECORD.

One in six American workers depends directly or indirectly on the auto industry for a livelihood. We should not hastily decide the industry's fate. As part of my subcommittee's ongoing examination of the industry, I hope our February 8 hearing will contribute to public debate and congressional deliberations on the implications of the FTC's tentative decision.

The editorial follows:

A DOUBLETHINK DEAL

That year of years arrived one week early at the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). As envisioned by 1984's author, George Orwell, loyal subjects of the totalitarian future will find it necessary to engage in "doublethink." This is the process by which one persuades oneself that two devoutly contradictory ideas both are true, as in "war is peace"; "freedom is slavery"; and "ignorance is strength."

Doublethink now reigns at the FTC and is being perpetrated as national economic policy. By a 3-2 majority, the FTC voted to permit General Motors Corp. (GM) to produce small cars in the United States jointly with Toyota Motor Co. The FTC majority contends that this sweetheart deal between the world's largest auto maker, GM, and No. 3 Toyota does not violate antitrust laws and does not reduce competition.

Indeed, one Timothy J. Muris, director of the FTC's "Bureau of Competition," dared to commit doublethink flagrantly in public. He argues that just because two giant corporate competitors now are going to be partners, that doesn't mean that competition will be reduced. People who believe that it will be are relying on what Mr. Muris calls "discredited" notions that competition results when competitors actually compete.

He cites new theories of competition that stress how much consumers benefit from highly concentrated industries. In the old days, such industries were called "trusts." Antitrust laws were passed to prevent them because trusts develop concentrated powers of economic monopoly.

Chrysler, Ford, and American Motors executives define "competition" the old-fashioned way. They denounce this GM-Toyota partnership as unfair, which it is, and as a violation of antitrust laws, which it also is. Patricia P. Bailey, a Republican FTC commissioner, said in dissent that if this deal isn't a violation of antitrust law, "what is?"

This GM-Toyota deal is defended on the grounds that it will be of limited duration (12 years); will produce only 200,000 cars per year; will create jobs; and will teach GM how to produce better, cheaper, small cars that eventually will benefit U.S. consumers.

This economic nonsense insults the intelligence. If the goal is competition and jobs, let Toyota build its own U.S. plant. If the goal is to teach GM how to build cars, let GM learn by competing the old-fashioned way. If the problem is Japan's cars being cheaper and sounder, examine the real causes—Japanese productivity is higher, labor costs far less, taxes are lower, and the U.S. dollar is grossly overvalued while the Japanese yen is too low.

This deal sets a dangerous, indefensible precedent. The courts should rule it illegal. Failing that, Congress should out-law it. ●

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN
RICHARD L. OTTINGER, JANU-
ARY 6, 1984, ANNOUNCING HIS
RETIREMENT FROM CON-
GRESS**

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1984, I announced in my district that I would not be seeking another term in Congress. A number of my colleagues have asked my reasons for this decision. I therefore include hereafter the statement I made announcing my reasons:

I want to thank you all for taking time out of your busy lives to be with me today. There are so many long time friends and helpers, people with whom I've endlessly walked the streets and beaches, people who have volunteered so selflessly to be of help. Particular thanks to Mike and Lynn Kitzmiller who flew from Washington to be with me, and to the incomparable Belle D'Onofrio for making all the arrangements so capably.

I want you all to know the real reason for the announcement I am making today: I want to set a good example for President Reagan!

I'd like to take my text today from the Old Testament: "To every thing there is a season and a time to every purpose under heaven: A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant, and a time to pluck that which is planted * * * " For me this is such a time.

I have decided not to seek another term. I make this announcement with very deep and mixed emotions. I am enormously grateful for the privilege to have served. I cherish the opportunities afforded to affect public policy, to help the communities in which I was raised and the thousands who seek help through my offices. The satisfactions of that service are enormous.

On the other hand, I look forward to leading a more normal, balanced life and,

twenty years after my first election to Congress, to serve in new ways and undertake new challenges.

Let me answer some of the questions that have been asked by my good friends and supporters to whom I have related this decision.

Why do I leave this fascinating profession during my prime of life, at a time when reelection looks more promising than ever?

My answer is, this is the time to leave, when I'm at the top of form and still young enough to start another career. You would not want me to leave when it could be said I was shirking a difficult challenge.

How can I leave at a time when the problems that face the country about which I care so deeply seem more critical than ever before in our history?

I don't presume that I can solve those problems. Indeed, one of the reasons for my decision is the incredible frustration of being in Congress and still feeling as powerless as the average citizen to affect the great issues before the country, like war and peace. I will still try to make my voice heard on these issues, but through other forums.

What about the Party? Is it right to bow out in the wake of the loss of the County Executive, and under conditions where it will be difficult to hold the seat?

I care deeply about my party and take great pride in having been the first Democratic Congressman from Westchester in modern times when I was first elected in 1964. I wanted to step down two years ago, but decided to stay and continue to serve my constituents. One important reason was that, after redistricting, I felt I might be the only Democrat who could hold the seat. I can't delay a decision I feel is right forever on those grounds. I would not serve my party or constituents well staying beyond my time.

Why do I feel this is the right time for me to change careers?

First, the frustrations to which I have referred are overwhelming.

To be sure, I have many accomplishments in office of which I am very proud, to be sure—my participation in establishing the environment as a priority consideration of the country; formation of the Environmental Study Conference as the largest bi-partisan, bicameral institution of the Congress; my role in achieving the most fundamental reforms in the history of the House when I returned in 1974—eliminating the abuses of the seniority system, limiting Members to one chairmanship and thus giving many more the opportunity to lead, opening up the processes of Congress to public scrutiny—and as Energy Chairman, bringing conservation and renewables to the forefront of American consciousness; these are the most significant, together with the less dramatic, but very important task of giving the very best service I can to my constituents.

Still, even with my organizing of the National Economic Recovery Project for development of sound alternatives to the Reagan economic policies, which was endorsed by 153 of my colleagues, I find my ability to change major national policies minimal.

I am frankly distressed at the failure of the leadership in the House to define adequately alternatives to the policies of the Reagan Administration, policies that I consider the most dangerous and destructive of fundamental American values of any Administration in our history. Under Reagan we have become a militaristic society, conducting foreign policy at the point of a gun. We have become a callous society, abandon-

ing our traditional concerns for the poor, the unemployed, the disabled, senior citizens, deteriorating cities, mass transportation, energy conservation, housing, education and health care.

The House has been the one Democratic institution of government these past three years. The leadership has succeeded in stemming the draconian cuts in job, education, health and environmental programs proposed by Reagan. It has put together an excellent statement of Democratic principles under the able leadership of Congressman Gillis Long, chairman of the Democratic Caucus. And it has supported some limited legislative initiatives, as with the housing bill passed at the end of the last session. What it has failed to do is put together a cohesive Democratic alternative, present it in legislation, and require Reagan and the Republican Senate to have to deal with it.

What should we be doing?
We should be spelling out firm criteria for arms control to rectify the total failure of the Reagan Administration to seek ways to avoid nuclear confrontation with the Russians.

We should be defining a foreign policy for the nation to stop the militarization of international affairs pursued by Reagan.

We should be acting to bring the budget into better balance by restoring the nation's tax base, assuring that those who profit from our system pay their fair share, and by cutting obscenely wasteful and dangerous defense excesses and other counterproductive giveaways.

We should be acting to remove the insidious influence of money from politics. It is fundamentally corrupting our democratic system.

We should be acting to assure that no one in this great country goes hungry while we pay farmers not to grow crops. We should be passing legislation to assure consumer protection, citizen safety, environmental enforcement, education of our children, jobs for the unemployed, civil rights at home and human rights abroad.

In short, we in the House should be passing legislation reaffirming all the great American values Reagan has sought to destroy, to assure that ours remains a peace seeking, equitable and humane society. We should be serving up legislation to this effect to the Senate and Reagan and putting the pressure of the country on them to pass and sign it.

Without a leadership willing or able to lead on these critical issues of our time, the individual Congressman feels powerless. This is something that will not change regardless of the outcome of the next elections.

Besides the frustrations of the office, there are other reasons for my leaving now. While the opportunities and satisfactions of public life are enormous, the burdens of doing the job right are monumental. Working a seven-day week with tough campaigns every two years is wearing. The amount to read and know is staggering. The pressures are constant. I long for the luxury most Americans enjoy—the weekend—time for family and friends and time to read and contemplate beyond the demands of work.

Then, too, I don't believe that the job of a Representative should be a lifetime expectation. I will have served in Congress for sixteen years at the end of this term (and run every two years for twenty years). I don't feel stale in the job, but I don't want to get stale, as I have seen with too many of my colleagues who stayed too long.

Lastly, I have long wanted to teach and write. Leaving now will give me that opportunity. I relish the opportunity to help send forth a new generation of bright, well informed young people, equipped to shoulder the responsibilities of creating a better future for our country and its people.

Cervantes once said, "Time ripens all things. No man is born wise." I have grown tremendously in this job and acquired a rich experience that I would seek to pass on to tomorrow's leaders.

I want to thank my most wonderful and dedicated staff for their effective service, all those fabulous people who have volunteered their help along the way, the unions, environmental and consumer groups, the minorities who have been so wonderfully supportive, the many individuals who have contributed to my campaigns, and the voters who have expressed their confidence by electing me eight times, even though the positions I have taken were sometimes unpopular. This support is an incomparable satisfaction.

If there is one lesson I would pass on to my successor, it is to vote your conscience—to do what you truly believe is right for the country. Your constituents will respect you, even though they may not agree with your stance.

I thank, too, the conscientious press that has covered my activities well over the years, the editors that have flattered me by their support and improved me by their criticism, and the public officials of both parties with whom I have enjoyed working.

I am grateful to my party and its leaders who have encouraged me—from Bill Luddy who brought me into public life, the incomparably loyal Miriam Jackson, Sam Fredman, Max Berking, to Tom Carty who does such a splendid job today—and my predecessor, Ogden Reid, who has been such a good friend and from whom I have learned so much.

I am enormously grateful to my wife, Sharon, and the rest of my family all of whom have been so supportive. I particularly appreciate that my daughter, Jenny, flew from Washington to be with me today. I want to make it clear that none of them put any pressure on me to make this decision, much as they may have wanted more of my time and attention and much as I have wanted to give them more. They have always emphasized that they would be happiest if I did what I thought was right and would support me fully in that decision.

My staff and I pledge to continue to give the best service to the people of Westchester and the nation of which we are capable during the year that remains of our tenure. I want to emphasize that I will still be your Congressman for the next year; the public should continue to call on us for help. We will then leave next year with the satisfaction that we have given it our best and with deep gratitude for having had the opportunity to serve Westchester and the Nation in the Congress of the United States.

In closing, I'd like to recall the question posed by my youngest son, Larry, in the midst of my first campaign, complaining about its imposition on his time. He asked, "Daddy, when will Ottinger-for-Congress be over?" Well, I have a year left of my service in Congress, but today I can answer Larry's question. Ottinger-for-Congress is over now.●

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NEED FOR GREAT LAKES
WATER PRESERVATION ACT,
H.R. 4366

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 10, 1984 I introduced legislation H.R. 4366, which would prohibit diversions of Great Lakes water for use outside of a Great Lakes State. One of the most serious issues facing our country today and in the future will be the scarcity of fresh water. Many expanding areas of the country will be facing severe shortages of water and be unable to meet the demands of the residents or industries of their area. At the present time the Great Lakes region of the country enjoys a surplus of fresh water. This is a resource we must protect and use wisely. As other areas of the country needs for water increase there will be demands that the Great Lakes region share its water supplies.

Wisconsin Gov. Anthony Earl wrote an article for the January 30 edition of USA Today concerning the issue of Great Lakes water diversion. He brought out some very interesting points about this problem, which you may find of interest. The following is a copy of Governor Earl's article for your review.

SHARE OUR WATER? NO, WE NEED IT ALL

MADISON, WIS.—Those of us living on the Great Lakes—including our Canadian neighbors—are on a collision course with the Sunbelt of the United States.

The issue? Water.
Put simply, the Great Lakes basin has water. The Sun Belt is running dry. And eyes in the southern and western USA are beginning to turn hopefully, enviously, toward our water.

But major movements of water from one part of the country to another are environmentally unsound and economically foolish.

For the 37 million people and one-third of the nation's industry in the Great Lakes basin, fresh water is the basis for our way of life and is essential for our economic well-being. The lakes are necessary for transportation, manufacturing, agriculture. They influence our climate, generate energy, and are vital to our ecosystem.

Some people have compared bodies of water to natural resources such as mineral deposits. But an underground vein of coal is not a vital and interactive partner in the environment like the water lapping the shores of Lake Superior.

Those in the dry belt also forget another player in this possible tug of war. Most Canadians live along the Great Lakes, and they won't sit by while these international waters are drained away.

Water diversion could only damage the lakes. The International Joint Commission estimates that lowering the lakes by only one inch could cost the region more than \$200 million annually in decreased shipping, dredging costs and lost power generation. The environmental damage would be severe.

And the commission estimates that the rate of water consumption by the region's residents will double by 2000, and increase eightfold in the next 50 years.

Even without water raids, studies indicate that our region could be facing water shortages in communities, damage to fishing and recreation, and disruption of shipping.

Obviously, regardless of court rulings, lawsuits and legislation, we will have little water to share.

Billions already have been spent by the federal government on water projects "to make the desert bloom." Yet none of the dams, irrigation works or other projects have been economically justified. They have only created insatiable thirst for a resource that cannot replenish itself.

Yes, parts of our nation are depleting their water resources much faster than they are being replaced. But depleting the water resources of the rest of us is not an acceptable solution.

To threaten the health of the Great Lakes region in a vain attempt to solve another region's dilemma would only result in foundering economies in two regions instead of one.●

TRIBUTE TO BILLY STRAUSS

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding boxer from Wilkes-Barre, Pa., is Billy Strauss, one of Wilkes-Barre's most distinguished fighters in an era of boxing's golden years from 1937 to 1952.

Billy Strauss was born November 3, 1923, in Hanover Township. He is the son of the late William and Stella Strauss. Billy's boxing career spanned 15 years. He fought 127 amateur and 89 professional bouts. His first amateur fight was at the age of 13. He won the National AAU Boxing Championship as a lightweight in 1937.

He also won the Navy's 3d Fleet (Pacific) Light Heavyweight Championship in the Honolulu Bowl in 1943. Billy never won a professional championship, but fought some of the best. He twice defeated Freddy Beshore, who fought top-notch contenders such as Ezzard Charles, Joe Louis, Jersey Joe Walcott, and Archie Moore. Although a light heavyweight at 178 pounds, he took on many heavyweights who outweighed him by as much as 40 to 50 pounds. Billy retired from the ring in 1952 and for years headed the Wyoming Valley Old Timer Boxing Association.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the entire community in paying tribute to this outstanding athlete and citizen.●

REAGAN'S FAULTY NUMBERS

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan, in last week's state of the Union address, expressed great optimism regarding America's current employment situation and high praise for his administration's economic policies which have resulted in a declining unemployment rate.

Today, our Nation's unemployment still remains at excessively high levels. The December 1983 figure of 9.2 million unemployed or 8.2 percent of the labor force, is far above prerecession levels.

The "official" Government figures sharply understate the extent of unemployment by excluding from the tally, large numbers of unemployed and underemployed workers. A more accurate measure of unemployment would include the 1.5 million "discouraged workers," those who have stopped looking because unemployment is so high in their communities. Also, over 5½ million workers who want full-time jobs are on part-time schedules because of slack economic conditions. Only one-half of these workers have been added to the unemployment total. On this basis, 13.5 million, or 12 percent of the labor force, are unemployed and/or suffer severe loss of income.

The national statistics conceal far greater unemployment among many groups, many of whom are experiencing close to record high levels of joblessness. "Official" BLS figures reveal, for December 1983, the unemployment rate for all workers is 8.2 percent, for white workers it is 7.1 percent, for blacks it is 17.8 percent, Hispanics are at 11.6 percent, all youth (16-19) are at 20.1 percent, among black youth the rate is an appalling 49 percent and women (head of household) suffer a 10.7 percent rate.

National averages also conceal the fact that many States are still experiencing severe unemployment far above the average. These States are found in regions across the country. For example, the unemployment rates in our Southern States are 12 percent in Alabama, 10 percent in Kentucky, and West Virginia at 15 percent. In the Midwest, Ohio's total is 10 percent and Michigan is at 12 percent. Within these and other States, cities and rural areas are experiencing even worse unemployment.

The number of unemployed has declined by 2½ percentage points during the past 12 months (from 10.7 percent in December 1982 to 8.2 percent in December 1983). That gain just offsets the loss in the 12 months of November 1981 to November 1982 (from 8.3 per-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cent to 10.7 percent); it still has not restored the rate to the July 1981 prerecession level of 7.2 percent.

Labor force changes also affect the unemployment rate with slower growth lowering the unemployment rate. During the past 12 months, the labor force grew by 1.2 million, far less than the preceding year's growth of 2 million, and the 1.7 million growth from December 1980 to December 1981.

Even with the recovery continuing at its current pace, most forecasters are expecting unemployment to drop only marginally to about 7.6 to 8 percent by the end of 1984. That national level spells far higher rates for many, especially among minority groups.

Mr. Hobart Rowen, in his Washington Post editorial on January 26, 1984, expresses deep concern over President Reagan's use of economic statistics in explaining to all Americans that we are indeed on the road to "recovery."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit Mr. Rowen's article for the RECORD as further evidence that not all of America's workers are benefiting from this administration's economic policies despite "Reagan's numbers."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 26, 1984]

(By Hobart Rowen)

REAGAN'S NUMBERS: SOMETIMES HIS ECONOMIC STATISTICS DON'T SQUARE WITH THE FACTS

President Reagan has a marvelous way with statistics: he overwhelms an audience with such a rapid-fire barrage that it's often difficult, on the spot, to question any of his numbers. Yet, many of these numbers don't square with facts, as shown by reports from his own government's statistical agencies.

A case in point was a Washington Post interview that appeared last Sunday. In that conversation, Reagan was nervy enough to say that "I think much of what we have done with economic recovery has been more beneficial at the bottom of the economic ladder. . . ."

"The things that we have done in the economic recovery have benefited them first and most of all."

He cited some theoretical poverty income numbers to suggest that purchasing power had taken a devastating blow under Jimmy Carter—but has shot up dramatically during his administration. Yet Commerce Department data show that real disposable income (after taxes and inflation) increased at an annual rate of 2.9 percent in Carter's four years, against 2.4 percent in Reagan's three years.

Using fourth-quarter to fourth-quarter comparisons to give Reagan the benefit of a good final three months in 1983, the comparisons are 2.9 percent for Carter, 3 percent for Reagan.

But the president went on to make claims that more seriously distort a true picture of economic results. He said that even with the admittedly high current levels of unemployment, "a higher percentage of all of the people between 16 and 65 are actually employed today than at any time in our previous history."

He added that "for both women and minorities, the percentage of decline in unemployment is greater. . . than it has been for

January 31, 1984

the adult male or white male. So I think we have done these things."

It would be good news, for all America—but especially for black Americans, others in poverty, women, and those suffering in rural America—if Reagan's claims were factual.

But his statements on these issues are not only misleading but mostly untrue. There is only one limited piece of supporting evidence for any of the several statements quoted above: the rate of increase in actual jobs among blacks since the recovery began is 5 percent, compared with 4 percent for whites. That is not very surprising, considering how much lower black employment was to begin with.

Despite this marginal job gain for blacks, the historic ratio of black-to-white unemployment has worsened during the recovery.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in December 1983, the unemployment rate for blacks was 17.8 percent, or 2.5 times the white rate of only 7.1 percent. At the peak of the recession in December 1982, the black unemployment rate was 20.9 percent, or 2.2 times the white rate of 9.6 percent.

From the peak to the present, in other words, the black unemployment rate has dropped only 15 percent, while the white rate has dropped 26 percent.

Another, equally revealing, set of BLS figures is the ratio of unemployment in poverty areas (defined as those where at least 20 percent of the population is poor) to the rest of the country. In those depressed geographical areas—at the bottom of Reagan's "economic ladder"—unemployment was actually rising while the rest of the country was recovering, through September 1983. It wasn't until the last three months of 1983 that the jobless rate in the depressed areas also began to move down. But has there been greater progress among the poor, as Reagan wants us to believe? At the end of the year, the reduction in unemployment in the poverty areas was only 12 percent from the peak, compared with 22 percent everywhere else.

And how about Reagan's statement that regardless of the unemployment levels, a greater percentage of the population is actually gainfully employed than ever before?

He used as a definition "all the people between 16 and 65," a grouping not used in official statistics or defended as standard by experts on the labor force. Instead, the BLS cites total employment as a percentage of the population. And that now stands at 58.4 percent, while the record of 60.1 percent was set in 1979, before Reagan arrived in Washington.

And finally, women: Reagan claims that the percentage of unemployment declined more sharply for women than for men during his economic recovery. But according to BLS data, the rate of decline in unemployment last year was 25 percent for men and 22 percent for women.

It should be our responsibility, in the media, no less than that of the president's political opponents, to insist that he quit playing fast and loose with the numbers. The recovery in mainstream America is one fact, and no one can argue about that. But another fact is that recovery is passing by the blacks and other poor whom Reagan claims to be helping "first and most of all." ●

TO HONOR COACH FRANK
SERRAO

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I join with family, friends, and colleagues in honoring a truly inspirational leader among the students and faculty at the University of Redlands, Mr. Frank Serrao, who is retiring as head football coach of the University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.

Football has always played an important role in Frank's life. He played ball for, and was graduated from Bucknell University. World War II temporarily interrupted his pursuit of a career in football. He spent 3½ years in the U.S. Army. Following the war, Frank continued his education and received a master's degree at New York University in physical education.

In 1957 Frank was appointed head football coach at Redlands High School. There he led his teams to a 7-year record of 55-18-1, including three league titles and one CIF AAAA championship in 1961. While still in the high school coaching ranks, Frank's dedication to excellence in sports was reflected in his position as president of the Southern California Interscholastic Football Coaches Association. During this time, he also found time to coach three all-star teams, including the South Shrine team in 1962.

Frank continued his football career at the University of Redlands in 1964. His record there is enviable. In 20 years his teams won nine Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference Titles. He received coach of the year honors in the NAIA, District III, five times.

In 1976 Frank's outstanding coaching ability was recognized when he was named Pacific Coast College Coach of the Year. This was the year his team earned second place in the NAIA Division II National Championships. His win record while coaching at the University of Redlands is a mirror of his talent and dedication. During his tenure as head football coach, the university's football record was 109-76-1 including 68-26-1 in the Southern California Interscholastic Athletic Conference.

His awards and honors are many and well-deserved. In 1967 Frank was awarded the Distinguished Sportsman of the Year Award. He was also selected Coach of the Year NAIA District III five times. In 1976 Frank was Pacific Coast College Coach of the Year.

Despite his busy athletic schedule, Frank has taken the time to be active in various community organizations. He is a lifelong member of PTA. For 3 years he served on the Congregational

Church Board of Deacons. He was a member of the YMCA board for 3 years and for 28 years has been a member of the Kiwanis Club.

A family man, Frank has been married for 37 years to his lovely wife, Joan. They are very proud of their four children and three grandchildren.

During his career Frank inspired many young people onto bigger and better things in life. Through example and hard work he instilled a feeling of pride and accomplishment in his players. He will not be soon forgotten by those who learned so much from him nor by those gathered here tonight to pay tribute to this fine American. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to commend to the U.S. House of Representatives, Coach Frank Serrao. ●

BYRON G. ROGERS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1984

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words in memory of a good friend, Byron G. Rogers, who served 10 terms in this House and who passed away in Colorado in December.

Perhaps there is no better way to sum up Byron Rogers' time here than the way it was put by my colleague, PAT SCHROEDER, who said, "He was known as old 'civil-rights Rogers.'"

He was. And he worked tirelessly in that cause, and I think every American is living in a better country because of Byron Rogers, because of what he stood for, what he worked for and what he helped accomplish.

This was a public servant with no ego, devoted to his country and to his Colorado, a man who was fond of recalling how he had helped bring important water projects to his fellow Coloradans.

Byron was a good and a decent man and I am sorry that he is gone. I extend my sympathy to his family. ●

TRIBUTE TO AGNES CONLIN

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I spent many years in public education as a teacher in the Dade schools and as a member and later chairman of the Dade County School Board, and I have seen the difference that talented and dedicated teachers can make.

One such teacher is Agnes Conlin of Miami-Edison Senior High School.

Agnes retired from a successful 15-year teaching career in June 1983. She loved her job so much, however, that

she did not want to leave it. She found a way, with the help of Edison Principal Craig Sturgeon, to continue to contribute to public education as manager of the mathematics section of the school's comprehensive education program. In her own words, "My work at Edison Senior High School has been truly rewarding. In many ways, I believe I have learned more from my youngsters than they have learned from me."

Reporter Lillie Harris of the Miami-Edison Herald has written two articles about Agnes Conlin and the comprehensive education program, and I would like to share them with my colleagues.

As we debate and discuss ways to improve the education of our children, which is perhaps our most important responsibility to future generations of Americans, I hope we will all remember that it all begins with hardworking, dedicated, caring teachers like Agnes Conlin.

GRANDMA'S BACK

(By Lillie Harris)

The magnetic power of "love for Edison students" brought Agnes Conlin, former Alva School teacher and coordinator, out of her brief retirement and back to Edison October 10.

When Conlin left in June, she asked Principal Craig Sturgeon for the opportunity to work part-time to avoid the trauma of separation anxieties from the youngsters she loves. Sturgeon called on Conlin to manage the mathematics section of the Comprehensive Education program fourth, fifth and sixth periods.

Now that retirement has "set her free," Mrs. Conlin has more time to herself, but she misses the tremendous interactions of large classes and the enjoyable restlessness and hyperactivity of the ninth graders. She states, "There is a great degree of satisfaction in working with the mature, serious, seniors, to whom I promise my very best effort for graduation. Comprehensive Education is challenging every teaching technique I possess."

Conlin, who is better known as "Grandma" to her former Alva School students and graduates, agrees that students didn't even know she had left. Several students were fooled by Conlin's covered-up retirement plans. Delawrence Blue, a junior, confessed, "I didn't realize that she retired. It seems like she was here all the time."

Conlin was warmly welcomed by her former students and she exclaimed, "I have never been happier. I enjoy the best of two worlds—time with my Huskies and time with my youngsters." She spends most of her time at home with two adorable Huskies, Saber and Maxi-Million. She enjoys their company and hopes to build a new home in another year or two called The Husky Haven.

Although Conlin is the senior member of the faculty at age 68, in her younger years she attended the University of Pittsburgh, Barry University, and received her Masters Degree in Education at the University of Miami.

Now that she is teaching Comprehensive Education this year it gives her the opportunity to spend more time with her students

since the class only consists of one to five students per session.

A senior in Mrs. Conlin's fifth period class stated, "Mrs. Conlin teaches in a way students comprehend very well. Rounding numbers drove me crazy for three years, but I learned them in three days in her class. I really love Mrs. Conlin."

So now it seems that having lost Agnes Conlin to retirement once, we've gained her back again.

COMP ED HELPS
(By Lillie Harris)

Tremendous support from helpful students, administrators and staff has transformed room F-203 in the Business Education wing at Edison from storage space into a center for Comprehensive Education.

For the past six years the Florida Legislature has appropriated funds under the Compensatory Education Act for the provision of supplementary instructional services to students. As defined by the State Department of Education, a compensatory education program is "either one or a combination of related learning experiences which are provided to a particular target group in order to remediate diagnosed academic deficiencies and which are supplementary to other programs."

This particular program at Edison is divided into three groups, consisting of 13th year students who wish to continue working for a diploma in place of a certificate of completion, 12th year students, or current Seniors, who need reinforcement of basic skills before taking the State Student Assessment Test II to qualify for a diploma, and 11th year students or current Juniors, who need remediation of basic skills, said skills having been identified by the SSAT-I test. The primary purpose of the program is to reinforce and strengthen basic skills in the areas tested by the state of Florida.

Seniors have priority access to the center but all level students make their way to F-203 at noon for assistance.

The Comprehensive Education Center in F203 is designed for five students per session.

Mary Wright helps remediate students in reading and writing skills first, second, and third period, while Agnes Conlin remediates students in mathematics fourth, fifth, and sixth period. Students who attend the program are pulled from other elective classes and placed in one of the two teacher's classes.

If the students are not able to take the class during regular class hours, they may come four days a week from 6:55 a.m. until 7:25 a.m., or two days a week from 2:20 until 3:20.●

FELLOWSHIP IN ISRAEL FOR
ARAB-JEWISH YOUTH

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, alongside the endless weapons of destruction that continue to pile up in all the nations of the Middle East are experiments here and there that contain the seeds of fellowship, reconciliation, and peace. These programs seek to create an environment wherein Arabs and

Jews can communicate, learn about one another's traditions and experiences, and interact with honesty, trust, and confidence. They are grounds for hope.

One of the oldest and most effective programs is entitled "Fellowship in Israel for Arab-Jewish Youth." Chaired by Mrs. Gisela Wyzanski of Cambridge, Mass., Fellowship grew out of an interfaith organization launched in 1943 by a group of Christians around the world who assisted Jewish youth in Nazi-occupied Europe to emigrate to Palestine. Dr. Samuel Elliot, president of the American Unitarian Association at the time, founded the project.

In 1964, the organization became known as Fellowship in Israel for Arab-Jewish Youth. In the late 1970's an Israeli advisory committee composed of Moslems, Christians, and Jews was created to guide the programs supported by Fellowship. These programs include Interns for Peace, a language-training program at the Martin Buber Center, summer camp programs for Arab and Jewish youth, and Arab-Jewish student organizations.

War and peace, violence and nonviolence, hatred and reconciliation exist side by side in the Middle East. The forces of alienation and violence have the upperhand without question. Yet there is promise of long-term reconciliation in numerous programs such as Fellowship that operate outside of politics and governments, and draw on the voluntary work, support, and goodwill of peoples of many faiths and backgrounds. Unfortunately, these programs are meager in funds, often face establishment hostility, and pale in comparison with the military build-ups. With help they can grow.

I commend to my colleagues a brief statement on the Fellowship in Israel for Arab-Jewish Youth, which describes the programs that it supports. They deserve our support as well.

HOW CAN YOU BUILD PEACEABLE CO-EXISTENCE FOR ARABS AND JEWS?

PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY FELLOWSHIP IN ISRAEL FOR ARAB-JEWISH YOUTH

We are an American interfaith, non-political organization, supporting Israeli initiated projects, promoting closer relations between Arabs and Jews.

The projects we support bring about tangible results. Suspicion and hostility give way to acceptance, breaking down stereotypes and untapping good will.

Because we are a volunteer group, your entire donation fosters programs proving that tolerance, understanding and mutual cooperation can overcome decades of strife, bringing Arabs and Jews together in peace.

Forty years ago, in 1943, a group of Christians wanted to translate words of sympathy into action. An interfaith organization, Children to Palestine was founded under the leadership of the former president of the American Unitarian Association, Dr. Samuel A. Elliot. It supported Youth Aliyah in rescuing Jewish children from Nazi occupied Europe.

In 1964 the name was changed to Fellowship in Israel for Arab-Jewish Youth, to describe accurately the focus of our endeavors. In the late 1970's, recognizing the need for people on the spot to guide us in the choice of projects, an Israeli advisory committee was established, composed of Moslems, Christians and Jews.

Interns for Peace untap good will by immersing themselves in the daily lives of Arab and Jewish settlements. Young Arab and Jewish men and women serve two years of internship in one another's communities, working with parents, teachers, and governmental authorities to improve local conditions.

They bring much needed skills and at the same time learn about different ways of life. They are involved in local industry, sports activities, train teenage leaders for youth groups, run afterschool learning centers for mothers and children, aid village landscaping and improvement. A majority of the graduates has made a career out of bringing Jews and Arabs together in a variety of combined activities.

The Ulpan at the Martin Buber Center teaches Arabs and Jews one another's languages, the key to coexistence.

We fund extra curricular activities for students and their families, which enable people of all ages to socialize with their new friends, practice newly acquired language skills, learn to trust each other and understand different ways of life.

Partnership (Shutafut in Hebrew) involves Arabs and Jews in year round and summer programs. We fund summer camps for Arab and Jewish youth.

Under Shutafut's leadership, a Jewish Arab Committee for Jaffa worked for the renewal of the Moslem quarter.

Neve Shalom means Oasis of Peace (Isaiah 32.18). This unique community of Moslem, Christian Arabs, and Jews on a bare hill outside Jerusalem is proving that peaceful cooperation is a reality. The settlement is a focal point for many varied peace activities, radiating influence far beyond its current size. Fellowship and other outside sources support some of Neve Shalom's activities.

Neve Shalom runs a School for Peace with workshops, training courses, teaching intercultural meeting skills. Funds are needed for an enlarged followup program, which would help alumni put their new skills to work.

Oranim is the School of Education of the Kibbutz Movement, based at Haifa University.

Its program trains Arab and Jewish teachers. We helped fund a pre-academic course to upgrade underprivileged students, gave scholarships, and now aid an English drama group, in which Arab and Jewish students perform in Arab and Jewish high schools.

The Arab-Jewish Students Club at Haifa University is an informal meeting place for social and cultural events.

We fund programs that draw Moslem, Christian and Jewish students together in activities that provide a tension free atmosphere and untap the good will available.

Scholarships are awarded to a few Arab and Jewish students recommended by university deans. With our help a number of graduates in medicine and the liberal arts have completed their studies.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL L.
MILEWSKI

HON. FRANK HARRISON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1984, an outstanding young man from Dupont, Pa., will be awarded the highest distinction in Boy Scouting.

Michael L. Milewski will receive the Eagle Scout designation at a ceremony to be held in his honor. Michael is a member of troop 361. This represents an outstanding achievement and one in which all of us can take justifiable pride.

We all know that the youth of today represent the leaders of tomorrow, and in this case, Michael is so duly honored.

Mr. President, I join with Michael's family and friends in paying tribute to this outstanding young person.●

ISLAMIC FUNDAMENTALISM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit my Foreign Affairs Newsletter for January 1984 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ISLAMIC FUNDAMENTALISM

What is behind the toppling of the Shah of Iran, the takeover of the Grand Mosque in Mecca, the rebellion in Hama against Syrian President Assad, the murder of Egyptian President Sadat, the near coup in Bahrain, the dynamiting of our embassy in Beirut, the attacks on French and American installations and forces in Lebanon and Kuwait, and the assassination of the President of the American University of Beirut?

The answer is Islamic fundamentalism. The fundamentalist movement lacks unity, but its great strength more than once in history sent shock waves through the world. Islam embraces one billion people in 60 nations, and leaders in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia today are unsettled by the fundamentalist impulse. Believers see Islam on a triumphal march as it takes more radical forms and tells leaders in Muslim nations and the West to go to the devil.

There can be little doubt that the revolution in Iran in 1978-1979 has encouraged the revival of Islamic fundamentalism in the Middle East. Nabih Berri, a Lebanese Muslim leader, refers to the Iranian revolution as the third greatest in history, following those in France and Russia. He sees the Iranian revolution as one of the great importance in the Islamic world, affecting both the Sunni or majority Muslim grouping and the Shi'a sect, which is a minority Muslim grouping in most nations but a majority in Iran. Berri's message may be grim, but it should be heeded.

Islamic fundamentalism varies from country to country, but it has many roots and much appeal in those parts of the Muslim

world where there is popular dissatisfaction with western influence and with the failure of governments to solve problems. Inside their own countries, fundamentalists find themselves face to face with political coercion, economic backwardness, social injustice, and the problems that attend rapid modernization. They believe that through a return to Islam, they will achieve better leadership, economic progress, social reform, and a purification of morals. They want to remodel their public and private lives according to the precepts of their faith. When they look at the West, fundamentalists see atheism, nuclear weaponry, pollution, economic exploitation, immorality, conspicuous consumption, and exhibitions. For many, the West represents not liberal enlightenment, but spiritual darkness. These views are shaped by centuries of Islamic subservience to Christian Europe and by a sense of western disdain for Islam. Israel is hated by fundamentalists, but some grudgingly respect it. While fundamentalists are angry that Arab governments have not been able to dislodge Israel, they see Israel's religious nationalism as a strength they wish to emulate.

Expressions of Islamic fundamentalism differ substantially from country to country. In moderate forms, they include traditionally modest attire for women, rigid segregation of the sexes, a ban on alcoholic beverages, an emphasis on Islamic holy law instead of western legal codes, and overt social and political pressure in favor of Islamic ideals and the ways of the Koran in public and private conduct. In Iran and Lebanon in recent years, fundamentalism has also expressed itself in extreme forms, including suicidal terrorism. Motivated to some degree by the fear that their basic beliefs and culture may be destroyed, terrorists lash out at the perceived source of the threat, which in Lebanon includes the United States. Terrorists believe that violence affirms their own vitality and faith and may even be life-enhancing—those who commit suicide sacrifice themselves for the good of Islam and win for themselves a place in Paradise.

The profile of an Islamic fundamentalist is interesting. He tends to be under thirty years of age, college-educated, and of lower middle-class background and rural origin. He is intelligent, a high achiever, a type easily drawn into radical movements in big cities because of the dead end that he faces elsewhere in society. He finds solace in secret urban cells with other committed people. His jargon may be theological, but his focus is economic, social, and political.

As much as we would like to protect ourselves from this historic whirlwind, we cannot escape Islamic fundamentalism. In Lebanon, for example, the Shi'a Muslims are the largest sect and make up 40 percent of the population; economically, socially, and politically they are the most deprived group. The problem of fundamentalism will persist in Lebanon until these people are given a better deal and a fairer share of power. In Egypt, there is a strong tradition of fundamentalism among the Sunnis, so religious militants today are working hard to appeal to Egyptian youth. In Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and the Persian Gulf states, there are significant Shi'a communities which have an affinity for fundamentalism even if they do not endorse all aspects of the Iranian revolution. Americans overseas must learn to live with the threat of fundamentalist terrorism. Our soldiers and diplomats in many foreign lands are in peril as never

before. We must focus on greater caution, better security, and better collection, evaluation, and pooling of intelligence.

Governments in the Middle East address the internal threat of Islamic fundamentalism in many ways, including full cooperation, attempts at negotiation, and open repression. While the immediate danger of an uprising in any given country may be remote today, the possibility of widespread terrorism is ever present. Middle Eastern nations must discover how to protect themselves from suicidal assassins without choking off public life altogether.

Islamic fundamentalism will be with us for years to come. It is only a small consolation that this religious movement is on a collision course with Marxism as well. Hatred of us among fundamentalists is something that we simply will have to accept. Our best initiatives may serve only to minimize the threat to our direct interests. We have no alternative but to try to achieve peace in the Middle East, hoping that creative policies and reduced tensions will give rise to an environment in which fundamentalism is no longer a threat to us.●

REAGAN REVERSAL ON WATER
PROJECT FINANCING

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House an enormously significant development regarding the Reagan administration's position water policy reform. On January 24, 1984, President Reagan sent a letter to his campaign manager, Senator PAUL LAXALT, which was hand-delivered by Secretary of the Interior William Clark. The letter to Senator LAXALT contained a statement of fundamental changes in administration policy on cost-recovery and cost-sharing for Federal irrigation projects constructed by the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation. The President's letter was sent in response to correspondence from 15 western Senators objecting to previous administration efforts to force beneficiaries of Federal projects to share a substantial share of the costs of such projects.

Administration support was vital to the important legislative gains on water policy reform which were made during the 97th Congress on cost recovery for repairs and replacement of aging Federal reclamation project dams and on minimum local cost-sharing for construction costs of new reclamation dams. Now, the President has responded to pressure from influential western interests by reversing himself on these issues.

The clear message contained in these actions is that the President, despite his rhetoric on controlling spending, is willing to abandon worthwhile efforts to curb the deficit in the inter-

est of political expediency. The President's own Grace Commission on cost control cited the Federal water program as a major area where spending restraint could be exercised, yet the President has chosen to ignore the substantive recommendations of his own Commission.

A bipartisan group of conservatives and liberals in Congress, as well as environmental and taxpayer groups, have allied themselves with the administration over the past 3 years in order to achieve water policy reform. This difficult effort may become impossible without the support of the President for real efforts to control Federal spending and preserve our natural resources through water project financing reforms. Those who are familiar with the issue know that many of our less worthy multimillion-dollar Federal projects might not be built if beneficiaries were forced to pay a substantial share of project costs.

I am including for the RECORD President Reagan's letter to Senator LAXALT along with a response signed by a number of Democratic and Republican Members of Congress laying out the objectives to the President's change of heart on these issues. I am also including a statement from Senator HOWARD METZENBAUM and from the National Wildlife Federation concerning this issue. I commend these materials to my colleagues attention.

The material follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1984.
Hon. PAUL LAXALT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: Some time ago, you and 14 of your colleagues wrote to me expressing your concerns regarding water project development. I appreciated receiving this valuable counsel which has helped crystallize the extensive discussions within the Administration on this vital subject.

We all agree on the goals. These goals are to revitalize the magnificent water development programs launched early in our Nation's history. The Federal-State partnership has succeeded even beyond the dreams of those who developed the concept so many decades ago. This partnership has helped create abundant year-round water, electric and food supplies; reduced flooding, and provided low-cost inland, coastal and oceanic waterborne transportation. In addition, millions of Americans have enjoyed vast new opportunities for water-related recreation.

Providing enough high quality water promptly to those who need it is a task that has confronted Americans since the earliest days of our national experience. In the first summer at Plymouth, the Pilgrims experienced a summer drought that nearly ruined their crops. More than 350 years later, Americans had to contend with flooding on the Mississippi and the Colorado, and drought throughout most of the rest of the Nation. The lesson of these events is clear. Providing enough high quality water where and when it is needed is a never-ending process.

This Administration is committed to working with the States, local entities and those private sector interests concerned with water development all across America. We are rebuilding the Federal-State partnership so that we can resume water development efforts to avert water crises in the coming decades. We have accomplished the following:

Re-established the policy of State primacy in water rights resulting in less interference from the Federal Government in water resources management.

Reinforced State primacy by the repeal of a Federal non-reserved water rights opinion. Established and successfully implemented a process for negotiated settlements of Indian water rights disputes.

Offered States the option of having Federal reserved water rights within their boundaries expeditiously inventoried and quantified to enhance their management capability.

Implemented the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 to recognize advances in agricultural technology and the market economy based on the family farm, giving these farmers an opportunity to build commercial operations without realistic limitations on their access to land and irrigation water.

Establish new Principles and Guidelines for water project planning to remove cumbersome regulations and promote flexibility in planning, thereby encouraging water resources development.

Elevated water resources decisionmaking to the level of the Cabinet Council on Natural Resources and the Environment, chaired by the Secretary of the Interior.

Presented to Congress new project construction proposals incorporating increased non-Federal financing based on the tangible economic returns produced by the projects.

All of these actions have helped to rebuild and strengthen the foundations of the Federal-State partnership so we can move forward to develop much needed, environmentally sound and economically prudent water resources projects. We have made numerous studies and conducted extensive discussions within the Administration in quest of ways that the Administration, the Congress, the States, and the American people can develop true partnership arrangements that recognize realities of today's economics and tomorrow's environment. We are gratified that Congress is now addressing the key issues related to water project cost sharing and financing.

Water development needs, geography, climate, economy, fiscal capacity, and Federal interests all vary from State to State, and from region to region. Furthermore, the Federal Government has made prior commitments to individual States with regard to water development within their borders. During the past months, I have fully considered the views expressed by you, your colleagues, the Cabinet Council on Natural Resources and the Environment, and many of the Governors regarding how the Federal Government might participate in water project development and project financing under these conditions. Traditionally, many Federal water project beneficiaries have repaid the construction costs of their projects, but we all agree new partnership arrangements will be necessary to finance any additional projects in the future.

It is time to conclude the discussion and to establish a national water project financing policy so that we can get on with the job of completing projects where commitments already have been made and undertaking new

construction starts to meet the country's future needs.

Indeed, the construction of storage reservoirs has not kept pace with the increasing demand for water. As a result, our water supply is less reliable and more vulnerable to drought than it was a decade ago. We must develop even better ways to work together effectively. We will have to make the best use of the water we have if we are to avoid serious future problems. I am convinced that by working with State and local governments we can solve the problems of flood, drought, and quality.

The water project financing and cost-sharing policy of this Administration is:

All Federal water development agencies will continue to seek out new partnership arrangements with the States and other non-Federal interests in the financing and cost sharing of all proposed projects. Each such agency will negotiate reasonable financing arrangements for every project within its respective area of responsibility.

Prior commitments to individual States with regard to water development within their borders must be considered and shall be a factor in negotiations leading up to project construction.

Consistency in cost sharing for individual project purposes, with attendant equity, will be sought.

Project beneficiaries, not necessarily governmental entities, should ultimately bear a substantial part of the cost of all project development.

Safety problems at Federal dams should be corrected as expeditiously as possible. The cost of safety work should be borne by the Federal Government. However, if additional economic benefit results from the modification, appropriate cost sharing among the beneficiaries shall be allocated by the appropriate Secretary. Criteria to determine dam safety designation shall be developed by an interagency technical team in consultation with non-Federal parties.

The costs incurred by the Federal Government in project planning generally will be shared with project sponsors. Specific arrangements will differ among agencies because of their differing planning, authorizing, and funding procedures.

Once financing, cost sharing, and cost recovery arrangements have been agreed to, they will be reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget and submitted to the Congress for ultimate disposition.

This process will result in arrangements that are workable, fair, just, and practical. It will put into place the final building blocks in an improved program to meet America's current and impending water needs while recognizing Federal budgetary realities.

I sincerely appreciate your cooperation on this subject. Working together, we can move ahead into a new era of water project development for the benefit of the Nation and all Americans.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1984.
President RONALD REAGAN,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Reports that you have reversed yourself on support for major water policy reform have seriously disturbed liberals and conservatives in Congress, environmentalists, and taxpayers who have worked with your Administration for

three years to enact major water policy reforms.

A report in Wednesday's Washington Post cites your letter to Senator Paul Laxalt, delivered by Interior Secretary William Clark. In the letter you seem to change the Administration's stand on two major issues regarding the financing of the federal irrigation and water supply program administered in 17 Western states by the Bureau of Reclamation. The letter removes support from an Administration effort to ensure repayment by local beneficiaries of federal funds spent to repair and replace aging Reclamation dams, and you have backed away from the Administration's previous insistence on minimum standards for local cost-sharing on construction costs of all Bureau of Reclamation projects.

We are especially concerned about these actions in light of two key reforms achieved in Congress in 1982 on water project financing:

In April of 1982 the House overwhelmingly approved an amendment, which the Administration then supported, to ensure full repayment by project beneficiaries of the cost of repairing or replacing aging federal dams. The amendment to the 1982 Reclamation Safety of Dams Act was offered by conservative Republican Congressman Gerald Solomon of New York, and supported by a wide range of environmental and taxpayer groups as well as the Interior Department and the Administration. The House approved the Solomon Amendment to the Dam Safety bill by a solid majority of 212 to 140, but the Senate failed to act on the measure during the 97th Congress. A similar bill has again been reported by the House Interior Committee this year, without the payback provision for the authorized federal expenditure of \$650 million.

On the cost-sharing issue, a precedent was established in 1982 when Congress enacted a \$100 million supplemental authorization for the Central Arizona Reclamation Project with a provision that 20 percent of construction costs would be borne by project beneficiaries during construction of the newly-authorized part of the project. In accepting this minimum cost-sharing amendment, House Interior Committee Chairman Morris Udall stated on the floor of the House that "things have changed a lot in the last few years and those of us in the West have got to get used to the idea . . . that there must be more cost-sharing. I think you have won a victory in forcing us to pay attention to this, and I think you have set a precedent here . . ."

On both the local payback for dam repairs and the minimum local cost-sharing for new authorizations, Administration support has been critical. Your Administration began its tenure by calling for strong efforts to reduce the federal deficit and prevent waste of natural resources by instituting policies to ensure that the beneficiaries of federal projects would pay a fair share for the benefits they receive. It was recognized at that time only a clear policy dedicated to minimum cost-sharing levels for all projects and local payment for benefits received had any chance of reforming a federal policy which has in the past heavily subsidized most water projects. It is discouraging to the average American taxpayer to see federal funds spent on multi-million dollar federal projects which might not be built in beneficiaries were forced to pay a substantial share of project costs.

The benefits of the federal water program and the need to construct and maintain

worthy projects are obvious and important. Yet the magnitude of the deficits we face and calls from both the Administration and Congress to curb wasteful spending require that we seriously review the policies and traditions of the past in order to find ways to economize and eliminate unnecessary expenditures. Nearly all other federal programs have felt that need for spending restraint, and the water program must bear its fair share of this burden as well. Your own Private Sector Survey on Cost Control (Grace Commission) has indicated that substantial savings could be found in the federal water program through implementation of cost-sharing and cost-recovery proposals.

The full and unconditional support of your Administration will continue to be vital if we are to repeat the achievements of the past and take further steps in the coming year. Congress is due to soon consider a massive water project authorization bill for Army Corps of Engineers projects, and we will again consider adequate local cost-sharing and payback provisions for construction of ports, waterways, flood control, and other projects. We now envision substantial reforms in the federal water program, but achievements could be severely limited without the clear support of you and your Administration on these issues.

Your letter to Senator Laxalt raises serious questions in Congress about the position of the Administration on water policy reform. The specific issues of paybacks for dam repair and replacement and minimum local cost-sharing for all new projects will be special causes for concern. We call upon you to personally reiterate your original call for true reform of federal water project financing so that we can continue our efforts to persuade Congress of the need for major policy changes.

Sincerely,

Joel Pritchard, Peter H. Kostmayer,
Howard Wolpe, Bruce F. Vento, Claudine Schneider, Lane Evans, Jim Jeffords, Bob Edgar, Berkley Bedell, Silvio O. Conte, James L. Oberstar, Tom Petri, Don Ritter, Members of Congress; Howard Metzenbaum, U.S. Senator.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOWARD M. METZENBAUM ON REAGAN ADMINISTRATION WATER RESOURCE POLICY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Last night, we heard a lot of talk from the President about cutting the deficit. Yet, one day earlier, he blithely turned his back on his own water project cost sharing policy that would have helped blot out some of the red ink. That decision shows that the administration is more interested in projecting a responsible image than in actually pursuing responsible policies. Once again, the President has opted for political expediency over sound public policy.

For three years, the President has held the cost sharing banner high. But 1984 is an election year. So he decided it was easier to undercut his congressional allies than his western political cronies.

In the case of dam safety, the President's own figures show that repayment would bring in \$438 million to the Treasury out of a total estimated cost of \$561 million. But the administration would rather shift this half a billion burden to the U.S. taxpayer rather than the people who would benefit from the repairs.

At the same time he was tearing the cost sharing banner into tatters, the President was proposing a bill to sidestep existing rec-

lamation law, thus passing up another opportunity to cut the deficit.

The Hammer clause was adopted after painful and exhaustive deliberation. It is the law of the land. But that apparently doesn't count for much with this administration. Rather than trying to enforce the law, it is devoting its efforts to gutting it for the benefit of a handful of California agribusinesses.

I have no intention of letting any bill pass the Congress which repeals the Hammer clause. Further, if any such effort is made, I will offer a series of additional amendments to reimpose the residency requirement, tighten the acreage limitations, eliminate the ability to pay provisions, and more.

I would suggest that the administration and its allies think long and hard before mounting a serious effort to repeal the Hammer clause. I can assure them they will end up getting a lot more than they bargained for.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1984.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your statement on water policy in your letter to Senator Laxalt is deeply disappointing. You have called for "new partnership arrangements," which we take to mean that state and local interests must share a greater portion of the costs of federal water projects. Increased cost-sharing is a critical step in reforming the Federal water resource development program, one which conservationists have long supported. However, we regret that you have chosen not to establish uniform cost-sharing requirements—one set of standards that applies equitably to both East and West—as the policy of this Administration. By failing to ensure that all parties will be treated equally, your policy is unlikely to achieve its stated purpose—increasing the non-Federal share of water project costs. The most lenient of negotiated cost-sharing arrangements will soon become the standard for all.

We regret that you have recast your policy for the entire Federal water development program in response to a straightforward partisan appeal from a group of Western Republican Senators. It is a shame that such an historic opportunity for fiscal and environmental reform in this era of deficit spending has been sacrificed for short term political gain. Regrettably, states and local interests can now continue to press for the construction of water projects of dubious value, spared from the discipline of having to share much of their cost.

Congress must now bring fairness and balance to Federal water development programs in the absence of effective Presidential leadership.

Sincerely,

JAY D. HAIR. ●

AGENT ORANGE

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House took an important step toward remedying a calamitous problem. H.R. 1961 provides remedies for

Armed Forces personnel exposed to some of the worst horrors of 20th century warfare—radiation and chemical contamination. In many instances we are talking about vets or their families fearing to have children or examining newborn babies for deformities, despairing about their future and constantly living with their "peculiar problem." However, the bill we passed falls far short in both money and mercy. It is commendable, but \$4.7 million during the next fiscal year hardly reassures those bearing the mental and physical traumas.

We have all heard constituents tell us and the House of literally "bathing" in agent orange while serving our country in Vietnam. We now know that there was no adequate testing for long-range effects of dioxin, nor were soldiers given any special protection from this potentially lethal weapon. No one expected long-term effects. Yet here are our courageous men and women faced with a silent killer of bodies and minds.

When they came home, they had to fight a longer—and in many ways a more difficult—battle with the Veterans' Administration and others to recognize their grievance. How ironic that in a war that was so visible, the combatants returned to near anonymity.

When I review the bill I am struck by the small amount of money concerned. The Pentagon spent almost as much money advertising for new enlistees during the last two Super Bowls as the bill will cost in the upcoming fiscal year. Yet some would begrudge our veterans even this amount. What are we afraid of? How do we honor people who have been described as "an army waiting to die."

I have always believed that the touchstone of a society is how it treats its most needy and aggrieved citizens. Our veterans earned much more in the way of responsibility from us than this bill allots to them.●

DANGEROUS DRUG DIVERSION CONTROL ACT OF 1984

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with HAL SAWYER, the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Crime, to introduce today the Dangerous Drug Diversion Control Act of 1984.

This bill is the administration's package of substantive and technical changes in the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act which affect the way that potentially dangerous prescription drugs are handled and distributed by manufacturers, distributors, pharmacists, and physicians.

Last summer, the Subcommittee on Crime examined the very large problem of the abuse of dangerous prescription drugs. In 1982, close to 100,000 Americans of all ages went to hospital emergency rooms because of their reaction to controlled substances of this type, which are only lawfully obtained by a doctor's prescription. That number was just about three times the number of people who went to emergency rooms because of heroin, cocaine, marijuana, and LSD. According to the Federal Government's drug abuse warning network, 75 percent of the drugs identified in drug abuse related deaths reported by various medical examiners were prescription drugs. Abuse of these drugs, obtained and used outside the scope of responsible medical treatment, is the most devastating and widespread aspect of the drug abuse epidemic.

These potentially dangerous drugs are abused because the system of legal controls for them is circumvented in a variety of ways. It was made clear at that hearing that improvements in the existing system of legal controls are called for.

The bill which we are introducing was drafted by the administration and transmitted to Congress in 1983 by the President as part of a very large package of suggested criminal law revisions. We are concerned about the problem of the diversion of these drugs, and therefore we are introducing the President's "Diversion Control Amendments" in order to allow focused public and congressional consideration of this part of the administration's package of suggested improvements.

We did not develop these amendments, and we are not at this time endorsing or passing judgment on any particular provisions in this bill. Our purpose is to place before the House these proposals to address drug diversion problems which the administration has identified. These proposals were favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee on July 21, 1983, as part B of title V of S. 1762.

The bill that we are introducing today is what the President submitted and the Senate Judiciary Committee has reported except for the correction of obvious typographical errors, drafting errors, and inadvertent omissions of a strictly technical nature.

The subcommittee has scheduled its first hearing on this legislation for February 22, 1984. We look forward to hearing from the public, from the health care and pharmaceutical industries, from the law enforcement community, and from specialists in the problems of drug abuse for their comments and suggestions. As the evidence that I cited earlier makes plain, this is a major component of the crisis of drug abuse our society is now confronting. We are going to examine, ini-

tially in the context of the changes that the administration has proposed, all of the issues in the system of legal control of prescription drugs that are subject to abuse, and proposals for improvement.

Those who wish to participate in these hearings should contact counsel Eric Sterling, Subcommittee on Crime, 207 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, (202) 225-1695.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD, I may insert a brief description of the provisions.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 is the short title, the "Dangerous Drug Diversion Control Act of 1984." Subsection (b) explains that sections 2 through 13 are amendments to the Controlled Substances Act and sections 14 through 22 amend the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act.

Section 2 adds a definition of the term "isomer" and amends the definition of the term "narcotic drug".

Section 3 grants to the Attorney General the authority to schedule or reschedule drugs on an emergency basis. This would provide a headstart on the procedure now used to schedule controlled substances which frequently takes up to a year.

Section 4 expands the authority of the Attorney General to exempt from control compounds, mixtures or preparations in three categories: exempt over-the-counter preparations, exempt prescription preparations, and exempt chemical preparations.

Section 5 modifies the length of time for which a registration for a practitioner is valid. Currently all registrations must be renewed annually. This amendment would allow the Attorney General to issue registrations for up to 3 years for practitioners. In 1979 DEA estimated that this change could save \$700,000 annually.

Section 6 amends the requirements of registering practitioners who dispense or conduct research in controlled substances to allow the Attorney General to deny a registration on broader, public interest grounds than currently allowed, and provides five factors to be weighed in determining the public interest. This bill also includes the last sentence of subsection (f) which was inadvertently omitted in the President's submission and was not included in S. 1762.

Section 7 is an amendment similar to that in section 6 which allows the Attorney General to suspend or revoke a registration to manufacture, distribute or dispense upon a finding that the registrant has committed acts which would render the registration inconsistent with the public interest as defined in section 303(f) (21 U.S.C. 823(f)) as amended in section 6 of this bill.

Section 8 is intended to give the Attorney General the authority to take custody of controlled substances in circumstances in which a registrant ceases practice or goes out of business, or of the controlled substances of a registrant for which the registrant's registration has expired.

Sections 9 and 10 together rewrite the recordkeeping exemptions for practitioners who administer or prescribe controlled substances in the lawful course of their practice in section 307(c)(1) (A) and (B) (21 U.S.C. 827(c)(1) (A) and (B)). Clause (A) currently applies to the prescribing or administering of narcotic controlled substances. Section 9

rewrites it to apply only to the prescribing of any controlled substances in schedules II through V.

Clause (B) currently applies to dispensing of nonnarcotic controlled substances by a practitioner. Section 10 rewrites the clause to apply the exemption to the administering of any controlled substance by the practitioner unless the practitioner regularly engages in the dispensing or administering of controlled substances and charges for the substances.

Section 10(b) requires that registrants report their change of business or professional address to the Attorney General.

Section 11 amends the offenses in section 403(a)(2) (21 U.S.C. 843(a)(2)) of using a fictitious, revoked, or suspended registration number to include "expired" registration numbers.

Section 12 provides authority for the Attorney General to make grants to State and local governments to assist them in controlling the diversion of controlled substances.

Section 13 amends the forfeiture provisions of the Controlled Substances Act to allow the forfeiture of controlled substances possessed in violation of the CSA. It is intended to apply to the situation in which controlled substances are held by a registrant whose registration for those particular drugs has expired. Contraband drugs held in "simple possession" are already subject to forfeiture under section 511(f) (21 U.S.C. 881(f)).

Section 14 expands the circumstances under which the Attorney General may allow the import of schedule I and II substances and narcotic schedule III, IV and V substances to include importation of limited quantities for scientific, analytical, or research uses exclusively.

Section 15 would allow the Attorney General to require more stringent documentation in support of the import of nonnarcotic schedule III substances which are comparable to those required for narcotic schedule III substances. This amendment includes the last sentence of the existing law which was inadvertently omitted in the President's submission.

Section 16 tightens up on the export of controlled substances from the United States (i.e., schedule III and IV substances and narcotic schedule V substances) to require proof that the export does not violate the law of the importing country for consumption for medical, scientific or other legitimate purposes and that the Attorney General may require an import permit (from the receiving country) in the case of a nonnarcotic schedule III substance. This helps to limit the role of the U.S. as a source of diversion to the rest of the world, and reciprocates for the type of controls that the U.S. would like all legitimate drug exporting countries to apply to their own exports.

Section 17 tightens up the export of schedule V controlled substances by requiring a registration for persons undertaking such exports.

Section 18 amends the registration requirements for importers and exporters of schedule I and II substances to allow the Attorney General to consider whether the registration is consistent with the public interest by modifying the factors that shall be considered in determining the public interest.

Section 19 strengthens the effect of a registration to import or export to limit the authority of the registration to only the controlled substances specified in the registra-

tion. The existing law provides a limitation only with respect to schedule I or II substances provided for in a registration.

Section 20 amends the registration requirements for importers and exporters of schedule III, IV and V substances to allow the Attorney General to consider whether the registration is consistent with the public interest by modifying the factors provided for in existing law.

Section 21 would allow the Attorney General to deny, revoke or suspend a registration taking into consideration the factors for determining the public interest spelled out in sections 18 and 20; and would allow the Attorney General to limit the revocation or suspension of a registration to particular controlled substances; provides for a hearing to be held on an order to be served by the Attorney General upon the registrant to show cause why the registration should not be denied, revoked or suspended; provides that the Attorney General may simultaneously suspend any registration and institute other proceedings in cases in which the Attorney General finds that there is an imminent danger to the public health and safety; and provides for the seizure and forfeiture of controlled substances in the custody of a registrant subject to the above proceedings.

The section also amends the current provision that gives holders of a registration as a bulk manufacturer an opportunity for a hearing prior to issuing to a second party a registration as a bulk manufacturer, or prior to authorizing an importation of a schedule I or II substance. The amendment eliminates the provision allowing the Attorney General to dispense with such a hearing in the case of an emergency, and spells out that the purpose of the hearing is to allow those already holding a registration "to comment upon the adequacy of existing competition among domestic manufacturers."

Section 22 amends the authority for the Attorney General to authorize the importation of certain narcotic raw materials, specifically poppy straw and concentrate of poppy straw, which the Attorney General finds to be necessary for medical or scientific purposes.●

WILLIAM E. LITTLE

HON. TIM VALENTINE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep regret at the passing of a great leader in North Carolina agriculture and a close and dear friend of mine, William Edward Little.

Bill Little was born and raised on a farm in Pitt County, N.C., where he inherited the great American values shared by our farmers. A 1942 graduate of North Carolina State University with degrees in agricultural education, he served his country during World War II, rising to the rank of Army captain. He remained in the Army Reserve until 1971, retiring as a lieutenant colonel.

From early on in his career, Bill Little put his farm background to opti-

mum use. He taught vocational agriculture for 6 years at Grimesland High School, and served as president of the Pitt County Farm Bureau. He joined the State Farm Bureau staff in 1952 as a field service representative, and held that position for 12 years. In April 1964 he was appointed commodity director, and served in that capacity for the remainder of his life.

While producing tobacco, beef cattle, and grain on a Nash County farm, Bill Little was an active citizen in his community. He was a member of the board of trustees of Nash General Hospital in Rocky Mount, and served on the North Carolina Education Advisory Committee. He belonged to Sandy Cross Methodist Church, where he taught Sunday School, and was a member of the Coopers Ruritan Club.

I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Willa Lee, his son, William E., Jr., and his daughter, Patricia Maurer. Bill Little's dedication to the farmers of our State and Nation and his valued friendship will be greatly missed by me and by all those who were fortunate to know him.●

ARKANSANS SUPPORT DEFENSE
BUILDUP

HON. ED BETHUNE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. BETHUNE. Mr. Speaker, a television station in Arkansas recently conducted an instant telephone poll during their 6 o'clock news program. Channel 5, KF5M in Fort Smith, Ark., asked their viewers if they agreed with President Reagan's statement on January 16 that the world is now a safer place because of America's recent military buildup. Bur Edson, anchor and executive editor of KF5M reported that by a margin of better than 78 percent, viewers felt the world was a safer place and that the President's military buildup over the past 3 years has reduced the risk of a superpower confrontation.

The unilateral disarmers may get more press coverage, but obviously, not everyone agrees with them.●

H.R. 1961, THE AGENT ORANGE
AND ATOMIC VETERANS
RELIEF ACT

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to use this opportunity to express my support for the measure recently approved by the House, H.R. 1961, the

Agent Orange and Atomic Veterans Relief Act. As a cosponsor of this landmark legislation, I am extremely gratified that my colleagues have chosen to formally acknowledge the unique health problems of these veterans by agreeing on benefits to compensate Vietnam veterans suffering the effects of the herbicide agent orange and World War II veterans who have been exposed to atomic radiation.

Not 1 week goes by that I do not hear of another poignant story of a veteran in Maine unable to cope with the degenerative health problems that they believe are attributable to exposure. Their virtual inability to deal with these problems have had a demoralizing and devastating effect on their relationship with their family, friends, and society. These veterans are understandably discouraged. Many have given up hope, and are disbelieving that for too long their repeated requests for help have gone unheard.

The issues of herbicide and radiation exposure are unquestionably complex, frustrating, and riddled with emotion. We are all familiar with the past problems the Congress, the Veterans' Administration and the veterans' organizations themselves have had just identifying the problems, much less agreeing on a solution. But this impasse has now ended with the House passage of H.R. 1961 and I believe the situation will continue to change in the future.

In my home State of Maine nearly 1,700 veterans have visited the hospital facility to be examined for agent orange exposure. These exams were encouraged by a State committee that was the fourth of its kind in the Nation. While many remain uncounted, the participation of Maine's veterans in the program has been encouraging.

At the same time I have heard from dozens of veterans who had been exposed to radiation testing, and their spouses, who frankly are frightened. Special attention is needed to properly alleviate their suffering. The concerns of all these veterans can no longer be overlooked.

For these reasons I chose to be a cosponsor of H.R. 1961. I plan to continue to encourage future efforts which will help identify these veterans, establish a scientific link between exposure and illnesses, and develop proper compensation programs to assist these veterans and their dependents. H.R. 1961 is only the first complete chapter in which promises to be a long study on herbicide and radiation exposure. But, in the end, I hope that the results will convince us all that we are responsible for properly caring for these veterans.

Again, I am pleased with the approval of H.R. 1961 in the House and hope that the Senate will act expeditiously on this measure.●

TRIBUTE TO ANATOLY SHCHARANSKY

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, Anatoly Shcharansky was 36 years old on January 20, 1984. The photos of Dr. Shcharansky which have been released indicate that he looks much older than his age would suggest. Reports from the Soviet Union indicate that he is suffering from heart disease and the effects of malnutrition. It is unclear whether or not he will ever regain his health.

The halfway point in Dr. Shcharansky's sentence was September 15, 1983. Soviet law permits his release upon completion of one half of the sentence. The time has more than come for the Soviet authorities to recognize that little is gained by killing this man by inches. The time has come to release Dr. Shcharansky and allow him and his fellow dissidents to emigrate to Israel.

Dr. Shcharansky has contributed some brilliant insights to science. Those contributions, made as a young man, will insure his place in the memory of all people who value knowledge. These contributions do not constitute a threat to the Soviet Union, but rather, expand basic knowledge upon which applied scientists can build.

It is important for us as Members of Congress to communicate concern for Dr. Shcharansky, and concern for all who are persecuted based on their desire to practice their religion or pursue causes which are anathema to the Soviet Government. Anatoly Shcharansky, and his struggle for human rights, must not be forgotten. Throughout history, individuals who have stood firm have provided the inspiration for others to resist the suppression of freedom, hope and knowledge. Anatoly Shcharansky stands as a model of personal courage to all who value freedom.

It is my hope that the leaders of the Soviet Union will see fit to release Dr. Shcharansky, and his fellow dissidents and allow them to emigrate.●

REAUTHORIZE MORTGAGE REVENUE BONDS

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with a growing number of my colleagues in urging that this body move rapidly to extend the mortgage revenue bond program

that terminated on December 31, 1983, because it was packaged in a tax reform bill that many of us could not support.

In my State of California, a total of \$1.475 billion in bonds were sold in 1983. Local government bonds generated nearly 21,000 housing units, and the State bonds financed another 4,750. This accounted for 10 percent of the building activity in California, according to the California Building Industry Association.

The construction activity brought about by the sale of these bonds accounted for 16,320 jobs which, in turn, generated another 26,560 additional jobs to California's general economy.

The mortgage revenue bond program is worthy of extension. It has an excellent track record.

There are probably 3 million households that can qualify for the benefits if they are extended. Only one-fifth of that total will be able to move into a new home without an extension.

Like many of my colleagues, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1176, which eliminates the sunset provisions of the mortgage revenue bond program. I should prefer we adopt H.R. 1176, but absent that, I should hope that we pass legislation that would extend the basic program which has meant so much to so many in the past and holds an equal amount of hope and promise for so many others.●

A TRIBUTE TO A JOURNALIST

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of this legislative body and the American people the great contributions of Herb Brin. I speak not only as a Member of Congress from southern California and a member of the Jewish community of Los Angeles, but also as a personal friend of Herb Brin.

Herb Brin is one of the most prolific, courageous, and imaginative journalists working in America today.

Herb Brin's chain of Anglo-Jewish weeklies—including the Southwest Jewish Press-Heritage and companion Heritage Papers in San Diego, Orange County, and central California—have won numerous awards for both journalistic excellence and community service. Across much of America, ethnic weeklies often serve primarily as vehicles for publicity releases issued by community groups and agencies. Brin's publications, on the other hand, have emphasized investigative reporting, original analysis, and a readiness to raise controversial issues others fear to touch.

What puts Herb Brin in a class all by himself is that he never speaks as an outsider. His incisive analyses of the Los Angeles Jewish community and its constituent organizations are always made by one who identifies completely with the community. To paraphrase the Passover liturgy, Herb Brin never raises an accusatory voice to say, "You are wrong." Instead he asks with love and respect, "Are we not wrong?"

Herb Brin is a many-faceted man, a tough crusader, a genius of polemics. However, Herb is also an incredibly sensitive and gentle person. His four widely acclaimed books of poetry and his reflections on the Holocaust—obliterated Jewish communities of Eastern Europe—show talents and sensibilities quite different from those seen in Herb's newspapers work.

On November 27, 1983, the Zionist Organization of America paid special tribute to Herb Brin for his consistent, effective, and eloquent support of the State of Israel. The honors paid to Herb by the Zionist Organization of America are but the most recent signs of recognition from a grateful community.

Herb Brin and his son Dan—who now bears much of the responsibility for the Brin papers—run counter to all the tendencies in modern journalism. The Brin papers put news and editorial integrity ahead of advertising revenues. They give front page coverage not only to the old, established voices in the community, but also to those with new and often challenging ideas. While it is easy to find points of disagreement with the material on the pages of the Heritage publications, it is impossible to find items that are dull, condescending, or stale. The papers are invariably thought provoking and, even more important, conscience pricking.

It was for Herb Brin and the rare publisher and writer who shares his merits that the first amendment was written. I, along with Herb Brin's numerous other friends, admirers, and loyal readers are proud of the passionate, responsible, and intelligent use Herb makes of our precious freedom of expression.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my congressional colleagues to join me in saluting Herb Brin and wishing him and his family good health and long life. May he continue to succeed in fulfilling the Biblical dictum proudly emblazoned on each Heritage publication, "Justice, Justice Shalt Thou Pursue * * *"

USIA REVISITED

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, on September 23, 1982, former Represent-

ative Toby Moffett inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an essay, "Paranoia Reagan Style," that was written by one of my constituents, Richard Curry. In that article Mr. Curry, a professor of history at the University of Connecticut, outlined his experience as a Fulbright scholar and lecturer when he traveled under the auspices of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) to New Zealand and Australia in 1981. Professor Curry explains that before and throughout his trip, he was approached on a number of occasions by USIA officials and strongly encouraged to both interject and support the Reagan administration's views in his speeches.

Upon learning about my constituent's somewhat "Orwellian" experience, I was extremely concerned. The right to free speech is fundamental to the American way of life. This principle has always been extended to our traveling academics as a reflection of America's democratic ideals. Not only does any deviation from this tradition threaten the credibility of our exchange programs but brings us closer to George Orwell's truly frightening vision of a totalitarian state.

Professor Curry recently completed a supplement to his first piece entitled, "USIA Revisited"—Organization of American Historians Newsletter, November 1983. In this article, Mr. Curry sums up his experience and describes similar complaints by other scholars since his original essay was first published. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to insert this second article into the RECORD in the hope that we can all learn from Professor Curry's accounts. His essays serve to remind us how easily our right to free speech and thought can be encroached upon. We, as a Congress, must fight to prevent our society from falling prey to Orwell's predictions for 1984.

THE USIA REVISITED

(By Richard O. Curry)

(Note: To avoid confusion the terms USIA and USICA are used interchangeably. The Agency's name was not changed from USICA to USIA until the fall of 1982.)

My article, "An American Scholar Abroad," which appeared in the OAH Newsletter (August 1982) and was reprinted in the Congressional Record (September 23, 1982, E 4384-85), has produced a number of responses and reactions: in the media; from academics in New Zealand, Australia, and the United States; from USIA officials in Washington (including its director Charles Z. Wick); and from three members of Congress (particularly ex-Congressman Toby Moffett and Representative Sam Gejdenson of Connecticut, a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee).

First of all, the article received quite a bit of media attention in the northeast: radio interviews, talk show appearances, an Associated Press wire story (August 12, 1983), a feature article in the Hartford Courant (August 29, 1982), and an extremely critical Courant editorial entitled "American Propaganda Machine" (September 21, 1982). "Richard O. Curry's unhappy experience

with the U.S. International Communications Agency," the editorial began, was not unique either for this or previous administrations. Any effort by the government to stifle free speech does this nation far more damage than could any criticism by an American scholar. This administration, in particular, has been blatant in trying to impose its mindset on others.

The Voice of America (VOA), a semi-autonomous unit of ICA, has been in turmoil for the past year amid charges it is turning from objective news and information to provide a good-guys-versus-bad-guys view of the world.

The effectiveness of American cultural and academic exchange programs is compromised to the extent that they are viewed by foreigners as mere instruments of national propaganda.

It is also a matter of public record that the Reagan administration made a serious effort in Congress to undermine the Fulbright program. As Congressman Toby Moffett phrased it: "Last year, proponents of cultural exchange were successful in blocking a proposal to reduce Fulbright funds by 66% [italics mine]. If the bi-partisan coalition remains strong, we can continue this cultural initiative" (letter to the author, March 30, 1982).

At the same time, however, the Reagan administration called for substantial increases in USIA's total budget. Why? The only viable explanation seems to be the Reagan administration's desire for total control of all exchange programs. In short, if USIA administers Fulbright, it cannot arbitrarily choose recipients. Fulbright awards are based on bilateral agreements with 120 foreign countries which have as much input into the selection process as the U.S. government. Conversely, all participants in the USIA Speaker's Program are hand-picked by agency officials.

The most amazing aspect of USIA's politicization was the candor of Director Charles Wick and other agency officials in declaring publicly that the Agency's primary function was to serve as an arm of the Reagan administration's foreign policy rather than presenting a balanced account of American life and society required by its charter. Mr. Wick took this position in his response to Fred Warner Neal's "Reorganizing Scholars" (New York Times, March 9, 1983) as did other agency officials in response to my own criticisms.

For example, Rosemary Keogh, a Hartford Courant staff writer, did a feature based on "An American Scholar Abroad" entitled "Professor Claims Intimidation By U.S. Overseas" (August 29, 1982). In the process, she elicited some revealing comments from USIA official Leslie Lisle. According to Keogh: An ICA spokesman acknowledged this week that the agency tries to select speakers who know and support the administration's foreign policy.

"If they're going to talk about the current foreign policy of this administration, we insist they be informed and that they not go out and talk against it. . . . We want them to make a clear and convincing statement; otherwise it destroys our credibility."

Lisle said the policy does impinge upon the speakers' right to freedom of speech "to a certain extent," but added, "They are being sent out as current foreign policy spokesmen."

Former administrations have had similar policies, he said, but it has never been stated "quite so clearly."

Still another USIA functionary, Phyllis Kaminsky, Director of USIA's Public Liaison Office, in identical letters to the Hartford Courant (September 28, 1982) and the OAH Newsletter (November 1982), reaffirmed that political considerations played a major role in selecting speakers sent out to discuss "current administration foreign policy." Kaminsky implied, however, that since I was not a foreign policy "expert," USIA was not concerned about my political views. Kaminsky neatly dodged the issue I raised by stating: "We are unable to verify Mr. Curry's account of his conversations with our diplomats in Australia." If for "the sake of discussion we accept his version," Kaminsky declared, it was clear that I had misunderstood "the import" of my briefings.

It was rather difficult, however, to mistake "the import" of a warning by an ICA official in Canberra that sharp criticism of Reagan administration policies could have only one result: "You'll never get another Fulbright!" (My detailed response to Kaminsky appeared in the OAH Newsletter, February 1983).

Foreign policy "expert" or not, the fact that I was prepared to lecture on the concepts of Manifest Destiny and Mission in American history and on the prevalence of conspiracy fears and conspiracy rhetoric in American politics—subjects which have important contemporary overtones—had not been overlooked by the head of USIA in Australia.

As evidenced by Fred Neal's encounter with USIA, and indeed those of Professors John Seiler and Harold M. Hyman among others, it is clear that my own experiences were not atypical. Seiler's treatment by USIA is the worst example of partisan political abuse yet to be reported—and one that has not received the media attention it deserves. Seiler, who teaches at Dutchess County Community College in Poughkeepsie, New York, wrote to Congressman Sam Gejdenson on May 1, 1983 that:

In my case the Agency planned a lecture tour of six African countries; an overall itinerary was developed, specific appointments made for me in each of these countries, and flights booked from New York City to leave in November 1981. Eight days before the planned departure date, the Agency phoned to tell me of the cancellation, because (as the Agency told first me and then Congressional callers) my published views were not considered sufficiently supportive of U.S. policy toward South Africa. I subsequently sued the Agency and Mr. Wick in the Federal District Court in the District of Columbia. On December 23, 1982, Mr. Wick offered a settlement, just one day before depositions were to be taken from him and other Agency officials involved in the case. Although I promised not to make public the terms of that settlement, I can say that I sued for \$285,000 and that, of course, I remain free constitutionally to testify in writing and orally or otherwise to write about the decisionmaking process in which I was involved.

Gejdenson (responding to letters from Seiler, Hyman, and several from me which included copies of letters received from correspondents in Australia, New Zealand, and the United States regarding USIA abuse) wrote a very pointed letter to Director Wick on June 6, 1983 asking for a detailed explanation of alleged malfeasance on USIA's part.

Wick's reply to Gejdenson on June 20, 1983 was truly astonishing. It was, in fact, a

repudiation of policy positions that Wick and other Agency officials had taken publicly only a few months earlier. "First," Wick declared, "I would like to reiterate this Agency's commitment to the integrity of the Fulbright Program" (quite a contrast to the Reagan administration's earlier attempts to cut funding by two-thirds). Equally important, Wick also denied that the political views of individuals sent abroad under USIA auspices were taken into consideration in their selection process. Keep in mind that Wick did not state that the Agency had changed or repudiated its earlier publicly stated policy positions. Rather, he declared: "When a lecturer speaks on a topic which bears on current administration policy, we expect him to be able to explain what this policy is. He is not, however, required to defend it."

Moreover, Wick—in contrast to Phyllis Kaminsky, who questioned the accuracy of my account in the OAH Newsletter—admitted that the charges had some substance. It was not, however, the result of Agency policy. "Dr. Curry's topics were historical in nature," Wick said, "and did not therefore require an exposition of American policy." But Wick admitted nevertheless: "This does not deny Dr. Curry's perception of tactlessness by a USIA officer."

For a time, I was puzzled by Wick's reply to Gejdenson. How, I wondered, could Wick possibly deny to a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that political considerations were not a factor in choosing individuals to participate in USIA's Speakers' Program since he and several other Agency bureaucrats had earlier admitted in public that this was precisely their policy?

The answer was not long in coming. In late June, Gejdenson sent to me a copy of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Report on the State Department Authorization Bill (Report No. 98-130). "In this report," Gejdenson wrote, "the committee expresses its concern about claims that USIA has violated its charter in a number of ways. . . . This is an important warning to USIA officials that Congress will not tolerate these types of actions."

In part, the committee report was a bombshell. It was not covered in the national media and deserves quotation. "Over the past 2 years," the report stated, "USIA has arguably violated the letter and spirit of its charter by (a) attempting unsuccessfully, virtually to eliminate the funding for the educational and cultural affairs programs which have stood the test of time and proved their worth; (b) reflecting partisan political ideology in its choice of USIA grantees; (c) providing funds to friends of USIA officials without regard to the USIA charter, or proper grant guidelines and procedures; (d) attempting to influence the activities and comments of USIA grantees so that they reflected executive branch policy positions; (e) withholding or delaying the granting of USIA funds to grantees due to partisan political considerations; and (f) placing in career Foreign Service and civil service positions, political appointees who reflect partisan political views, or who are friends and relations of current Government political appointees, without regard to the requirements of specific positions, or the effect on the career services." (pp. 64-65)

Having expended a great deal of time and effort publicizing these issues, reading these conclusions was quite satisfying. My exuberance lessened considerably, however, as the report concluded: When these matters were

brought to the attention of USIA Director Charles Z. Wick, he took immediate steps to make the necessary adjustments and corrections to restore the integrity of these programs, and to restore the confidence of the grantees, the Congress, and the public. He is to be commended for his prompt, sincere and effective efforts to remedy the situation. (p. 65)

Thus, an extremely critical report by the House Foreign Affairs Committee concluded by giving Mr. Wick and USIA high marks for cleaning up his/its act.

In recent months, Mr. Wick has continued to occupy the high ground. In a recent profile by Bernard Weinraub (New York Times, August 11, 1983), Wick stated:

"At the beginning there was this concern that we'd have a conservative, hardline bent. . . . My defense was that this is preposterous. The VOA charter says we must tell about America in a balanced way. To do what was alleged and feared would be illegal."

The fact that this statement contradicts earlier USIA policy positions and ignores the House Foreign Affairs Committee Report about past USIA improprieties and illegalities may not be as important as Wick's current awareness that his agency is now being carefully monitored by Congress. Congressman Gejdenson has assured me that he and other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee—especially the Subcommittee on International Operations chaired by Representative Dante Fascell—intend to keep a wary eye on future USIA activities.

At present, however, Wick is convinced that his performance is now a creditable one. In the Weinraub interview Wick also stated that "after two troubled and dismaying years as the organization's leader, he had not only buoyed it [USIA] but also begun to quell criticisms of his personal style." Even so, Wick admitted: "The criticisms are hard for me to deal with and, frankly, there are a lot of moles in this place." USIA's mission "had been consistent," Wick declared. "We want to explain the policies of our Government and the values and character of its people to other countries and other people." According to Weinraub, Wick stated that his effectiveness was best measured by the Soviet reactions to his efforts. "There's this vituperativeness against me personally. . . . Sometime it's a bit frightening, intimidating. They said I made millions of dollars in brothels, they call me a right-wing ideologue." He shrugged, and said he sometimes wondered if the K.G.B., the Soviet secret police, was "going to be after you."

At this point John W. Shirley, a career diplomat who serves as Mr. Wick's deputy, intervened. "The Soviets squawk why they're getting hurt," he said. "And they've been squawking a great deal more recently than any time in memory."

Whatever the validity of Wick's and Shirley's perceptions about the effect USIA activities have had on the Russians, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that past USIA improprieties have created a credibility gap with friends and allies overseas (as well as many academics at home)—a fact that Wick and his associates obviously do not recognize, but one that demands immediate and prolonged attention—in fact, rectification, if American ideals, as reflected by USIA programs, are to be a positive force in the world community.

For example, Harold M. Hyman, one of our most distinguished constitutional historians, was not sent overseas by USIA last

year despite numerous requests for lectures by scholars in the U.K. and western European countries. Hyman was told that USIA's failure to send him abroad was the result of "bureaucratic inefficiency." "Your agency," Hyman wrote to W. Scott Thompson (USIA's Associate Director for Programs) on April 4, 1983, certainly created no respect for itself or for the United States as represented by your agency, among the several eminent professors of American Studies in the UK and in European countries, who wished to have me lecture there. I enclose copies of some letters of this import. Some academics abroad did request me through the U.S. Embassy in their nations . . . and so that technical point seems not to exonerate USIA.

Other American scholars have, as you perhaps know, expressed their displeasure and concerns recently about ICA/USIA operations. I understand their positions better now. Can USIA really afford the accumulation of such dour estimates of your value and values?

Another American academic wrote that a visiting lecturer at his institution from the State Department "indicated that the Reagan administration had gone farther than any other in recent memory to employ ideologues in the ICA. Further, as a career diplomat, he went on to conclude that most of our international friends see through this transparent effort as propaganda." Still another American declared that in West Germany the only people connected with USIA who really understood American ideals were German employees of longstanding.

Numerous letters received from Australian and New Zealand academics reflect almost identical attitudes. One Australian wrote:

I am most grateful for your offprint of the OAH Newsletter item. Its content would be appalling were one not reasonably aware of ICA's general tendencies toward secretiveness and control. We—I—always suspect it, but your experience and the overt pressures are evidence which is both confirming and disturbing.

This individual went on to say that contacts with the Australian USIA constituted "an intellectual humiliation." In another letter the same person expressed the opinion that "often, the problem (believe it or not) is as much ignorance on their part as bad intentions/evil. I am amazed that State cannot recruit better people." The letter concludes: "Like the d— foreign policy: they're both stupid and dangerous."

"I was really horrified," a New Zealand academic wrote, to read about your experiences in Australia. . . . I think you have done a great service to the academic community here and in America by extracting this for publication. The actions in the Australian I.C.A. have set us back 15 years. . . . How stupid can they be?

Another New Zealander confided: "To be honest, I have always felt a little compromised in my relationships with the office." "Here in New Zealand," another Kiwi wrote, the I.C.A. people have been very cautious in comment although amusingly, and possibly because of "the Curry incident" they have been very anxious that we have our share (and more) of Fulbrights for 1983 and 1984. . . . I may be putting two and two together and coming up with 22 but our relations with I.C.A. seem to have cooled and warmed at the same time—treating us more cautiously but eager to help! However, am glad that you have put a spoke in the Reagan wheel!

Still other examples of reactions from scholars in the Antipodes could be cited; but the central points have been made with one major exception—the determination of Australians and New Zealanders to resist any attempt to politicize the Fulbright Program. As one individual phrased it:

I have no fears for the Fulbright Programme in N.Z. Any attempt by the U.S. Government to politicize it will be strongly resisted by the N.Z. members of the Foundation's Board of Directors. In your case our mistake was letting you go to Australia under the sponsorship of USICA. In the future any of our Fulbrighters who wish to go to Australia will do so under the sponsorship of the Fulbright Program.

These letters are a sad commentary on the low esteem in which USIA is currently held abroad. In some cases, contempt would not be too strong a word. The last letter, however, underscores an important point made earlier: the reasons for attempts by the Reagan administration to cut Fulbright funds by sixty-six percent—that is, the desire of ideologues to provide USIA with total control over all exchange programs. Fortunately, these efforts failed. But USIA's reputation is tarnished, and the image it has projected abroad will not soon be dispelled.

Richard Curry is a professor of history at the University of Connecticut. His many publications include "Ideology and Perception: Democratic and Republican Attitudes Toward Statehood Politics and the Copperhead Movement in West Virginia" (West Virginia History).●

HOUSE PASSES AGENT ORANGE BILL

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House passed H.R. 1961, the Agent Orange and Atomic Veterans Relief Act yesterday on a voice vote. However, I would like to remind my colleagues that the struggle to obtain compensation for the veterans affected by agent orange is not yet over. By obtaining House approval, H.R. 1961 has cleared only one of the major hurdles it faces in the coming months. I join my colleagues, the Honorable BOB EDGAR, of Pennsylvania and the Honorable TOM DASCHLE, of South Dakota in their special order, to urge the swift passage of H.R. 1961 through Congress so that those who gave of themselves to serve their country in war be granted compensation for illnesses or deaths believed to have resulted from wartime exposure to agent orange and radiation.

Our veterans demonstrated their dedication and patriotism when they gallantly and unselfishly came forth to serve their country in its time of need. While fighting for their country, many Vietnam veterans were exposed to herbicides, such as agent orange, used by our Government as a defoliant to destroy possible enemy hiding places. Agent orange, like other

dioxin-based chemicals, has been linked by a number of studies to diseases ranging from skin cancer and liver conditions to possible birth defects in the children of the veterans. Nearly 18,518 veterans and their families have filed claims with the Veterans' Administration asking for disability or death allowance for diseases or deaths caused by exposure to agent orange. For years, the Veterans' Administration has consistently denied them this compensation and has shown deliberate intransigence when directed by the Congress to conduct a study on the effects of exposure to agent orange. Although the study was mandated in 1979, it will not be completed until 1989, 10 years after the study was ordered. And even then, the study will be conducted by the Center for Disease Control since the Veterans' Administration could not conduct the study in a timely manner. In the meantime, thousands of veterans and their families have been awaiting word on the disposition of their claims and are unfairly being denied compensation even though the VA cannot offer adequate justification for this denial and even though numerous studies have shown a link between the diseases most commonly suffered by these veterans and agent orange exposure. The VA will only acknowledge chloracne as a resulting disease and therefore compensates only the small number of veterans suffering from chloracne. Our veterans have contributed enough of themselves to deserve better treatment at the hands of the VA, the agency set up to help them.

The bill that just cleared the House yesterday will provide a measure of compensation to these veterans that suffer from soft-tissue sarcoma, porphyria cutanea tarda (PCT)—a liver disease—and chloracne, since these diseases are presently believed to result from dioxin exposure. The bill sets conditions that must be met by the veterans in order to insure that the disease truly resulted from exposure to the chemicals during their service in Southeast Asia. In the case of sarcoma, the cancer must have been diagnosed within 20 years of the veteran's departure from Southeast Asia; in the cases of PCT and chloracne, the disease must have surfaced within 1 year of departure.

Furthermore, the bill also provides for compensation to veterans of World War II and Korea who suffered the detrimental effects of radiation in the postbomb occupation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It must be stressed that this bill, if enacted, provides only temporary relief for these veterans and compensation will come to an end 1 year after the completion of the Centers for Disease Control epidemiological study. But it does allow our Government to attempt to rectify the in-

justice suffered by these dedicated veterans as they struggled to cope with these diseases and to show our appreciation for the sacrifices they made for their country, for their families, and for all of us. The bill will now be considered by the Senate and I ask that the Senate will consider it a matter of top priority and grant speedy passage of the bill. We cannot afford to delay any longer than we already have in compensating the veterans that came forth to fight our country's battles. We owe at least this much to our veterans. ●

SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATION FOR AFRICA

HON. GUY V. MOLINARI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, almost daily we read or hear new reports of the millions in Africa who are facing starvation as a result of a severe famine and drought. Whether it be villagers in Nigeria forced to drink sand-filled water or citizens of Ghana consuming unripe crops as a means of survival, the world is confronted with a desperate situation. Many describe this famine as one of the worst in history.

I commend the administration for their request for an additional \$90 million appropriation to respond to this problem. Pending approval by this Congress, 200,000 metric tons of food aid will be available; 217,000 metric tons of emergency food aid has already been approved in this fiscal year by the Agency for International Development. Coming shortly after the January 6, 1984, announcement of an additional \$32.7 million in emergency aid, this demonstrates the responsiveness of this country to the need of others.

In November 1983, I had the honor of attending the Food and Agriculture Organization Conference in Rome. Adebayo Adedeji, who serves as the Executive Secretary to the Economic Commission for Africa, related the effects of food shortages on that continent. In 1972-74, for example, the number of severely hungry and malnourished people was 83 million. Today, that number has grown to an estimated 100 million. One out of three African children dies of hunger and malnutrition-related diseases before reaching school age. Many of those who do survive do not have the mental or physical capabilities to lead a productive life.

The drought, which began in 1982, continues to affect food production in Africa. Food stocks which were gathered in 1981 have been depleted in most of the 24 affected countries.

Most of these nations are unable to import the required food supplies. Civil strife has resulted in an increase in refugees and other displaced persons, thereby putting additional strains on the resources of governments.

The problems facing many African nations are severe, with no easy solutions. The United States has a moral obligation to give this needed aid to those countries whose citizens are facing a bleak and often hopeless future. This request is a step in the right direction and I urge my colleagues to take quick, favorable action. ●

NATIONAL NUTRITION MONITORING AND RELATED RESEARCH PROGRAM

HON. BUDDY MacKAY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. MacKAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1984, together with my colleagues GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., and DOUG WALGREN. The purpose of the bill is to establish and facilitate the timely implementation of a coordinated national nutrition monitoring and related research program. This program is designed to establish a scientific basis for the maintenance and improvement of the nutritional status of the U.S. population and the nutritional quality of the U.S. food supply.

This bill was not prepared as a hasty response to the President's Task Force on Food Assistance, but rather after over 6 years of oversight by Subcommittees of the Science and Technology Committee and the Agriculture Committee. These subcommittees found that present Federal efforts to collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate dietary and nutritional status data are untimely and give inadequate attention to assessing high-risk groups and geographic areas.

In addition, the present system does not provide for the continuous collection and interpretation of dietary, nutritional, and related health status information or for the monitoring of general health trends and their relationship to food practices and supplies.

Although I cannot support all of the recommendations of the President's Task Force on Food Assistance, the recommendation that the Federal Government take steps to improve information on the nutritional status of Americans is obviously on target. The bill we are introducing is consistent with the task force's recommendation and provides for a systematic and coordinated program and a comprehensive plan to improve the collection and reporting of nutritional status data.

In addition, the bill includes several components which are essential to insure that public funds expended for nutrition monitoring will return to the public, health professionals, and policymakers usable and objective information for enhancing the quality of life. These components include: technical assistance which State and local governments have requested in order to obtain data relevant to their constituents; opportunity for State and local governments, industry, the scientific community, and the public to participate in the development and implementation of the program; and research necessary to develop common indicators and cost-effective methods for data collection and dissemination.

Mr. Speaker, unless a coordinated nutrition monitoring program which provides for continuous data collection and interpretation is put in place now, this Nation will continue to have expensive piecemeal surveys incapable of generating early warning trends which may require corrective action. Likewise, policymakers will be without the necessary data to formulate and evaluate the consequences of nutrition and health policies and programs.

The proper implementation of the program we are introducing today could serve as an effective health promotion and disease prevention tool. One such means of reducing the high cost of health care is health promotion. Actions, such as proposed in this bill, to focus the efforts of both the Congress and the administration on wellness, rather than prevention, are long overdue.

I encourage our colleagues to join us in cosponsoring H.R. 4684, the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1984. ●

HAIL TO THE ORANGE, HAIL TO
THE BLUE, HAIL TO WHITE

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, this past season the Big 10 Conference finally advanced beyond the stage of the Big 2 in football. With the emergence of the University of Illinois, the conference can now be called the Big 3 in football, though my friends and colleagues from Iowa might argue for amendment to the Big 4.

In his fourth year as head coach of the Fighting Illini, Mike White brought victory-starved fans of the orange and blue what they had not tasted for 20 years—a Big 10 football crown. And for the three seasons previous to that he delivered an exciting, steadily improving brand of football.

Like our favorite son, Abe Lincoln, Mike White is not native to Illinois

but he has come to glory among its fertile fields and bustling cities and towns.

A native of the San Francisco Bay area, Mike White came to Illinois early in 1980 after a successful coaching career on the college and professional levels. Even before his success in Illinois, Mike's football reputation was assured by his tutelage of outstanding quarterbacks.

The roster of his pupils at that position reads like a future program for the Football Hall of Fame.

Steve Bartkowski, Vince Ferragamo, Jim Plunkett, and the late Joe Roth perfected their abilities under his coaching.

At Illinois, he developed two quarterbacks now playing professional football—Dave Wilson and Tony Eason.

For these and other achievements he has been honored many times by his peers and the media. The White family may have to add another room to their home just to display the honors that have poured in this year alone.

We in Illinois are willing to share Mike White with others, even Buckeyes and Badgers. Mike White represents the best in his field and we all profit from that example.

He is a man who works hard, develops talent, and builds that talent into a team with a winning spirit. That spirit has swept the prairies of Illinois and there are those who think it should not be contained by our borders.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that Mike White may be the coach we need to tackle the deficit and if I was not afraid of being lynched when I return home to Illinois, I would suggest that we attempt to lure him away from the University of Illinois and set him to balancing the budget as he has balanced the Fighting Illini.

For now and many years to come, we are proud of Mike White and prouder still of his outstanding achievements with the Fighting Illini.●

IN RECOGNITION OF THE
AMERICAN VETERAN

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in celebrating yesterday's unanimous passage of the Agent Orange and Atomic Veterans Relief Act. While many of us may feel that this measure does not go far enough to address the needs of affected veterans, the passage of this essential legislation represents an important victory for all our veterans who have fought for so long to be recognized.

The compromise bill, that was worked out by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will provide temporary disability and death allowances to veterans of the Vietnam era who suffer from certain effects stemming from their exposure to the chemical agent orange. In addition, this bill will compensate certain veterans who participated in the testing of nuclear devices or in the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki during World War II and were exposed to radiation.

The Center for Disease Control (CDC) is expected to complete its study of the health effects of agent orange in 1987 or 1988. Congress will then have a full year to analyze this study and then again act to pass the appropriate legislation.

While this bill is somewhat limited in scope, it will, if passed by the Senate, provide immediate relief and focus national attention on the plight of those veterans whose lives have been adversely changed due to their service to this Nation.

Today, as we witness a U.S. military presence in a number of countries throughout the world, it is important to remember the tremendous sacrifices made by our Nation's veterans. These men and women made a selfless contribution to this country when they accepted the risks associated with service. Too often, this sacrifice goes unnoticed. For this reason, I am pleased that Congress has taken this positive step to immediately compensate veterans who suffer from ailments brought about by service.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleagues on the passage of this bill reaffirming the House's support for our Nation's veterans and urge the Senate to act swiftly so that benefits can be granted as soon as possible.●

A TRIBUTE TO DR. ALBERT AND
MRS. CHARLOTTE LEVINE

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of this legislative body and the American people the great contributions of Dr. Albert and Mrs. Charlotte Levine. I speak not only as a Member of Congress from southern California and a member of the Jewish community of Los Angeles, but also as a personal friend of Dr. Albert and Mrs. Charlotte Levine.

On January 28, 1984, Dr. Albert H. Levine and his wife Charlotte were honored at the 16th annual scholarship dinner of Akiva Academy of Los Angeles. The theme of the evening, "A Global Affair," denotes Akiva Academy's cultural diversity with a student

body representing many countries around the world, as well as the United States.

Dr. and Mrs. Levine enjoy a long history of community involvement in a professional and personal capacity.

Dr. Levine was born in Cleveland, Ohio and his roots in the Jewish community were established at an early age through attendance at afternoon yeshiva in the neighborhood orthodox synagogue. He received his B.A. and M.D. degrees from Ohio State University where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. While at Ohio State, he was vice president of the Hillel Foundation and conducted Friday evening traditional services. After his internship, he served as a captain in the U.S. Army Medical Corps in Korea. During this time he also was the acting Jewish chaplain conducting Sabbath and holiday services and acting as spokesman for the military personnel of the Jewish faith in Korea.

Dr. Levine has been an advocate and supporter of Akiba Academy since its inception. The academy offers an enriched by cultural day school education program in Hebrew and general studies to the general community using the facilities of Sinai Temple. Dr. Levine serves on the board of Sinai Temple and is chairman of the Sinai-Akiba Liaison Committee. He is also on the board of overseers of Akiba Academy. His community activities have encompassed Cedars Sinai Medical Center, UCLA, B'nai B'rith, United Jewish Welfare Fund, Hebrew University, Technion, Guardiania, Shaare Zedek Hospital, Zionist Organization of America, Los Angeles Hebrew High School, among others. He has been medical adviser to the Brandeis Bardin Institute and has served as camp physician for the past 15 years.

Charlotte Levine is the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. S. Elihu Posin of Los Angeles and the granddaughter of the late Rabbi and Mrs. M. R. Posin of New York. Her background is in the field of social work and community planning. She has served as a city council appointee to the Citizens Planning Advisory Committee, working on portions of the Los Angeles Master Plan and its implementation. She is president of the Hollywood Homeowners Association and is a member of the Hollywood Coordinating Council and the Metro Rail Advisory Committee.

In addition to her support and activities on behalf of Akiba Academy, Charlotte Levine is a member of the Women for Brandeis-Bardin Institute and is a life member of both Haddasah and Technion.

Dr. and Mrs. Levine have been long-time active supporters of the symphony, theater and opera in Los Angeles as well as pursuing their interest in other cultures by frequent world travel.

The Levines are parents of two children, both of whom are graduates of the Hillel Hebrew Academy and Los Angeles Hebrew High School and are examples of their parents' dedication to the perpetuation of Judaism through intensive day school Jewish education.

I ask the members to join me in congratulating Dr. Albert and Charlotte Levine, their daughter, Shari-Ellen and son, Bruce, on this special occasion and to wish them many more years of success and fulfillment.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join in noting with Ukrainians around the world the 66th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, home to a proud people who are subjected unwillingly to Soviet oppression. Their independence, established in 1918, was sadly cut short after 3 years of heroic struggle against the numerically superior forces of Communist Russia.

The Ukrainian people, however, continue to demonstrate tremendous courage when faced with constant Soviet attempts to eradicate all forms of their culture and tradition. Despite the most severe forms of repression and religious persecution, Ukrainian culture and tradition still thrive. All Ukrainians retain a strong desire for freedom, and it is this desire from which they get their strength.

The Ukrainians are a symbol to the world of a people determined to maintain their culture, traditions, language, and religion even though the Soviet Union controls their society. Through their determination, the Ukrainians have succeeded in maintaining their nationalistic spirit, and that spirit remains alive today.

It is this spirit of freedom that we honor today. Let the Ukrainian people know that we in the United States recognize and respect their right to freedom and self-determination. We honor and encourage their perseverance. Their struggle is not, and will not, be forgotten.●

HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE U.S.S.R.

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, in 1949 George Orwell wrote "1984", an apocalyptic view of the future. I am pleased to note that many of Mr. Orwell's prophesies have been unfulfilled. However, there is a land

where many of the visions of "1984" are a reality. In the Soviet Union, dissidents are jailed, exiled, or sent to mental hospitals. Members of minority groups and non-Russian nationalities are routinely harassed when they attempt to express their own identity. Freedom of speech, press, travel, and religion are either limited or banned outright.

For a number of years I have been privileged to use my position to speak out on behalf of human rights for those who are oppressed in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. As a new member of the Ad Hoc Congressional Committee on the Baltic States and the Ukraine, I rise today to bring the attention of my colleagues to yet another case of denial of human rights in the U.S.S.R.

Yuriy Shukhevych has served almost 30 years in Soviet prisons merely because he has refused to denounce his father. General Roman Shukhevych was commander in chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army during World War II. This group fought for the independence of the Ukraine from both Nazi and Soviet forces. While most of us will disagree with the Soviet authorities over the appropriateness of General Shukhevych's actions, their subsequent treatment of his son is unacceptable by any standards.

Yuriy Shukhevych, blind and past 50, languishes in internal exile in Siberia. His only crime was to refuse to denounce his father and his father's actions; any Ukrainian patriot might do the same. For Shukhevych it has meant a 30-year tour of Soviet prisons.

Mr. Speaker, the Lawyers' Association of Philadelphia recently approved a resolution condemning the treatment of Yuriy Shukhevych and asking for his release. This is an example of what all American citizens can do on behalf of those mistreated by repressive governments. If we do not remember those imprisoned and mistreated because they follow the dictates of their conscience, no one else will. At this point, I would like to insert the text of the resolution into the RECORD:

LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION OF PHILADELPHIA RESOLUTION

Expressing concern for the inhumane treatment of Yuriy Shukhevych in Soviet prisons, and memorializing the President of the United States, the United States Congress, and the Department of State to use every means available to obtain his release.

Whereas basic human rights and fundamental freedoms have long been recognized as having valid universal significance and are currently a subject of pressing international concern; and,

Whereas these basic rights are spelled out in the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and,

Whereas the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has given a new dimension to the humanitarian

principles these covenants embody by reaffirming each state-signatory's right to be concerned with the manner in which human rights and fundamental freedoms are respected and implemented by all other signatories; and,

Whereas the President of the United States has expressed his deep concern and commitment to human rights in the world; and,

Whereas Yuriy Shukhevych has been incarcerated in Soviet prisons for almost thirty years merely for his refusal to denounce his father who, as Commander-in-Chief of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, fought the occupation of Ukraine; and,

Whereas the harsh treatment and severe sentence of Yuriy Shukhevych reaffirms that a system of repression exists in the Soviet Union and this fact greatly concerns the people of the United States; therefore,

Resolved, by the Lawyers' Association of Philadelphia, That we hereby express concern for the inhumane treatment and long sentence in Soviet prisons of Yuriy Shukhevych, and memorialize the President of the United States, the United States Congress, and the Department of State to use every means available to obtain the release of Yuriy Shukhevych from imprisonment and request that an exit visa for him and his family be granted.

Resolved, That an engrossed copy of this resolution be presented to William Nezowy, Vice Chairman of External Affairs of the Philadelphia Branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and certified copies to be sent to Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, to George P. Shultz, Secretary of State, and to Members of the United States Congress.

LEON W. TUCKER,
President, The Barristers'
Association of Philadelphia.
HENRY J. LUNARDI,
Chancellor, The Justinian Society.
MICHAEL J. STOCK, Jr.,
President, Brehon Law Society.
MAYER HORWITZ,
Chancellor,
Tau Epsilon Rho Law Fraternity.●

MONTEREY PARK APPRECIATION NIGHT

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, each year, California State University at Los Angeles honors individual communities in the San Gabriel Valley to show appreciation for students' participation and patronage of the university. It also provides a good way for city residents to become acquainted with their university.

On Friday, February 3, California State University at Los Angeles will hold "Monterey Park Appreciation Night." The reception, hosted by university president James M. Rosser, will feature the dedication of a room in the university union to the city of Monterey Park. Students from Monterey Park and individual honor students and their parents will be honored that

evening. The university has also extended an invitation to all citizens of Monterey Park to attend the reception and become better acquainted with their university. I encourage all to attend. Following the reception and dedication ceremony, the attendees will get the chance to cheer the California State Golden Eagles through an exciting, and we hope victorious, basketball game.

An event like this does not come about without the hard work and dedication of many people, such as President Rosser, the Monterey Park City Council, and president of the Monterey Park Chamber of Commerce, Marian Grant. Equally important is the reception's cosponsor, Omni Bank and President Don Rhodes.

I applaud the efforts of California State University at Los Angeles to show their gratitude to the people of Monterey Park and their excellent method of bringing higher education closer to the people.●

MORTGAGE REVENUE BOND PROGRAM

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for renewal of the mortgage revenue bond program. The State of Michigan and its people have participated fully in the program that expired on December 31 of last year. It has been hailed as a great success in our State and I am sure that participants across the country feel much the same. I want to commend the work of the many groups seeking a renewal of this vital legislation, particularly the National Association of Homebuilders. Their timely and helpful information promotes better understanding of the complex issues surrounding this program as well as the overall housing policy of our Nation.

Last year, the renewal of this program became tied to unrelated revenue raising measures which I and many others opposed. I am hopeful that this year we will see a clean renewal of the mortgage revenue bond program. The housing and employment policies of our country are improved by the program; its broad support here in Congress would insure swift passage. I urge my colleagues to pursue such a course.●

CARE FOR THE POOR

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, a recent survey of eight Western countries found that the United States ranked last in terms of care for the poor. I think that is a national disgrace, yet the Reagan administration continues to call for further cuts in domestic spending. The greatness of any nation is a reflection of its care for its least fortunate citizens. It is time that great compassion for our fellow man is restored to our list of national priorities.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of the Post article which summarizes the survey.

POVERTY SURVEY RANKS U.S. LAST

(By Margot Hornblower)

NEW YORK, Jan. 24—It is better to be poor in Sweden, France, West Germany, Australia, Israel, Canada and Britain than in most of the United States, according to a Columbia University study.

The three-year study by Alfred J. Kahn and Sheila B. Kamerman of Columbia's School of Social Work was financed by the U.S. Social Security Administration. It comes amid intense debate in Washington over changes in the "safety net" of social services, and after years of failed "welfare reform" programs.

"We are not doing very well by the families who are in financial difficulties, in contrast to most western countries, including those who are much poorer," Kahn said in an interview.

Other countries are more generous in compensating for the high costs of raising children: all eight countries studied except for the United States have child allowances. All except the United States and Australia have statutory maternity benefits.

"Civilized societies everywhere except in the United States recognize that children are a valuable resource and we have a responsibility to make sure they grow up healthy," Kahn said.

In Sweden, support payments to a single, unemployed mother with two children equal 93 percent of the income of the average worker in that country after taxes. The comparable figure for Pennsylvania, which is in the upper third of U.S. states in benefits, is 44 percent.

The District of Columbia, Virginia and Maryland have less-generous allocations in Aid to Families with Dependent Children, the principal welfare program, than does Pennsylvania, the study's benchmark.

Ranking in generosity after Sweden are France, which provides 78.6 percent of its average worker's wage after taxes; West Germany, at 67.3 percent; Canada at 52.5 percent; Britain at 51.7 percent and Australia and Israel at 50 percent.

Rebutting assertions that welfare mothers give birth in order to get aid, Kahn said, "The studies show there is no relationship between the generosity of a program and the birthrate. In every country, families without children are better off economically than families with children, and working families are better off than the unemployed."●

As for maternity benefits, he said, this is the only country where the law does not require companies to replace working mothers' lost income to some degree. In 1978, Congress required employers who give disability insurance to allow mothers to collect maternity benefits under those programs. However, he said, 60 percent of American working women still receive no income replacement during maternity leave.

In Israel, by contrast, mothers receive 75 percent of their wages for 12 weeks through a combination of contributions from employer and government. Sweden provides 90 percent of lost income for nine months. West Germany provides benefits for seven and a half months, France for 16 weeks, Canada for 17 weeks, and Britain for 18 weeks.

Sweden, France and West Germany have children's and housing allowances—which are taxed away in wealthier families. Kahn said the United States should offer tax credits for children, rather than tax deductions.●

TRIBUTE TO LUTHER HINNANT

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the life and work of Mr. Luther Hinnant, an individual who overcame major personal obstacles to achieve what many would have thought impossible.

Born January 12, 1899, in North Carolina, Mr. Hinnant went into the Army during World War I and on his return he decided to move to Washington, D.C., for employment reasons. Although finding a job proved difficult because Mr. Hinnant did not have a high school degree and because of his race, he never relented, and eventually he found employment as a presser in a drycleaning shop. While working at this job, Mr. Hinnant went to night school and earned his high school diploma.

Mr. Hinnant's life was to change dramatically in 1941 when he entered a Veterans' Administration hospital for an operation for a possible brain tumor. Although no tumor was found, the operation caused Mr. Hinnant to lose his eyesight. This unfortunate trauma, however, did not stop Mr. Hinnant. Instead, he was determined to continue his education and on the suggestion of another patient in the VA hospital he enrolled at the Hampton (Va.) Institute where he learned the essential skills for a blind man's existence. After he had mastered braille and received a youth certificate from the Hampton Institute, Mr. Hinnant went on to teach braille and to earn 52 college credits in general studies. Later, he attended a school for the blind in Illinois which helped him

cope with his day-to-day needs as a blind person.

Determined to obtain a college degree, at the age of 78 Mr. Hinnant enrolled in the University of Maryland's golden I.D. program which offers free class tuition for retired people. Since the fall of 1977 Mr. Hinnant attended classes every fall until last fall when he had earned enough credits to graduate with a 2-year degree in sociology and nutrition. Although this feat in itself is quite an accomplishment, Mr. Hinnant's motivation has made him determined to seek a bachelor's degree.

With all his setbacks, Mr. Hinnant has never lost sight of his goal. His dedication and determination to obtain a college degree and lifelong efforts in helping other blind people are the highest accomplishments an individual can achieve in his/her lifetime. Indeed, at the age of 84 Mr. Hinnant is still determined to dedicate his efforts to others as he is now qualified to teach braille at the Broward Center in Fort Lauderdale, Fla. I know how proud both of his daughters must feel over the accomplishments of their father. Mr. Hinnant is by all standards an individual who represents the best of human effort and commitment. He is a real living standard of dedication. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues here in the House and I would like to take this time to congratulate Mr. Hinnant for his lifelong endeavors. ●

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE DIPLOMACY

HON. THOMAS J. TAUKE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. TAUKE. Mr. Speaker, in a refreshing example of people-to-people diplomacy, a delegation of goodwill ambassadors representing Elkader, Iowa, recently traveled to Algeria to formally establish a sister city relationship with the Algerian city of Mascara. This relationship marks the first such agreement between a city in the United States and an Algerian city.

Elkader, a community of 1,600 people, was founded in 1846 along the banks of the Turkey River in northeast Iowa. One of the founders of the town was an admirer of a young Bedouin emir in Algeria named Abdel Kader, who at the time was leading the fight against a French invasion. Consequently, the town was named in honor of the man who has become a revered national hero in Algeria.

A young Algerian man visited Elkader last summer to see the community named after his nation's greatest hero. The friendliness displayed to him by the citizens of Elkader spurred him to initiate the establishment of a bond between Elkader and the city of

Abdel Kader's birth, Mascara. Details for the relationship and the trip were facilitated by the diligent efforts of Sister Cities International.

The Iowans traveled to Algeria earlier this month at the invitation of the Algerian Government. The delegation included: Mayor Ed Olson and his wife Ruth Mary; City Councilman Robert Grau and his wife Ruth; City Councilman John Miller and his wife Mariella; Clayton County Register Editor Donna Menken; former Register Publisher Harold Griffith and his wife Louise; and Superintendent of Schools Robert Buckner.

The Iowans received a warm welcome from their Algerian hosts. Plaques commemorating the sister city relationship were placed at Mascara's city hall and at the memorial honoring Abdel Kader. All reports indicate that our goodwill ambassadors upheld the highest traditions of American diplomacy while fostering a growing friendship with their hosts.

While the visit of the Iowans to Algeria may be a minor footnote in the annals of world diplomacy, it does reinforce an optimistic view of the world's future. If people from different lands and cultures can establish friendly relationships with one another based on respect and trust, perhaps nations can do the same.

For my colleagues' further information, I would like to include two articles from the January 15, 1984, Dubuque Telegraph-Herald about the Elkader delegation's trip.

The two articles follow:

[From the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald, Jan. 15, 1984]

ABEL KADER, IOWA TOWN'S NAMESAKE

(By Richard Hoops)

Few city names in Iowa carry Saharan sand within their syllables.

No breath of desert wind sweeps the rolling dunes of names like Balltown and Elma, Epworth and Hawkeye, Onslow and Stanley. No caravans plod across the consonants and vowels of Farmersburg and Schley, Spillville and Zwingle.

The North African origin to the name of Clayton County's government seat also may be concealed from the uninitiated. But the city of Elkader's namesake was not just another face on the stage of Algerian history. Abdel Kader—or Abd al Qadir as it sometimes is translated from Arabic—is one of the greatest heroes of that North African nation.

Abdel Kader and his father, Muhyi al Din, rose to prominence in 1832 as leaders of a revolt against the French invasion and domination of Algeria.

The invasion was preceded by a 30-year dispute between French and Algerian merchants over a grain purchase that the French failed to pay. In 1827, during an argument over the debt, an Algerian autocrat slapped a French consul in the face with a peacock-feather flywhisk and called him "a wicked, faithless, idol-worshipping rascal."

The king of France, Charles X, took this to be distasteful diplomacy and ordered a naval blockade of the port of Algiers when the Algerian leader refused to apologize.

Three years passed without expression of remorse from the Algerian chief. In 1830, a French military campaign began on Algerian soil. Algiers fell within weeks. The gold in the city's treasury more than paid for the expedition.

The invasion laid the groundwork for 132 years of French rule over all of Algeria. But it did not begin without fierce resistance from Muhyi al Din, a leader of a Muslim brotherhood, and his 24-year-old son, Abdel Kader.

Muhyi al Din proclaimed a holy war against the French in 1832 and conferred leadership of the war onto Abdel Kader.

"I am not so foolish as to imagine I can openly make headway against your troops," Abdel Kader wrote to the French king. "But I will harass them ceaselessly. We shall weary and harry you, and our climate will do the rest. . . . Have you seen the wave made when a gull brushes the sea with its wing? This is the image of your passing over Africa."

French troops, arms and a bloody "scorched earth" war slowly took their toll on the desert legions of Abdel Kader, the "phantom sultan." In 1847, after 15 years of war, the rebel leader surrendered and was imprisoned in France. He was released in 1855 and settled in Syria, where he became involved in academic and charitable work. He died in Damascus, Syria, in 1883.

Abdel Kader's spirit did not die, though. His green-and-white flag was adopted as the standard of the rebel National Liberation Front, which defeated the French in 1962 after eight years of civil war. His remains were returned to Algeria in 1966 and a national shrine, a mosque in the city of Constantine, was named after him.

Elkader, the northeast Iowa city that bears Abdel Kader's name, has become a sister city with Mascara, Algeria, the birthplace of the Algerian patriot. The relationship began when Benaoumer Zergaoui, an Algerian information assistant at the U.S. embassy in Algiers, read a story about Elkader's name.

Zergaoui visited Elkader last summer. Elkader Mayor Ed Olson and eight other city residents will visit Mascara this week. No major joint exchanges are planned for the near future, Olson said. But there is one exception.

Zergaoui has promised to send a picture of Abdel Kader to hang in the Elkader City Hall.

ELKADER RESIDENTS FIND SISTER CITY

(By Rich Hoops)

ELKADER, IOWA.—The June evening was windy, but warm—or so the story goes—as the three settlers stood on the wall of an old stone mill along the Turkey River in 1846 and pondered the future of their little burg in northeast Iowa.

"Don't you think it's about time we started making some real plans for this village?" asked one of the men, a hale fellow named John Thompson.

Timothy Davis and Chester Sage agreed. And they decided that the village especially needed a name.

"My good friends," Davis said, "I've always been an admirer of that young Bedouin emir of Algeria who led his people against an invasion by the French back in 1832. His name is Abdel Kader."

Thompson was surprised by this exotic suggestion for a name—and perhaps by the formal speech with which it was suggested.

"Who in the world would like a town named Abdel?" he asked.

"Well, let's not use that part at all," Davis replied. "Let's just call it Elkader."

"Elkader, I like that," Sage said. "It has a nice ring to it."

"Good, then it's agreed we call this town Elkader," Thompson said. "Let's meet here tomorrow and get this town laid out, so 125 years from now the people will have a record of things."

Fiction may have crept into Ed Olson's account of how Elkader was named, when Olson was editor of Elkader's weekly newspaper, the Clayton County Register, during the city's 125th birthday in 1971.

But Olson, now Elkader's mayor, said he was not the first person to take liberties with the tale of Elkader's christening.

The story circulated around town when Olson was young, and "sometimes the versions got changed," he said.

Olson's historical account contains a bit of fantasy. So do his travel plans this week. Thursday, Olson and eight other Elkader residents will leave the town named after Abdel Kader and travel to the city of the Algerian patriot's birth—Mascara, Algeria—to complete the first sister city relationship between a community in the United States and one in Algeria.

The relationship was initiated last year by a young Algerian who read that an Iowa city was named after one of his country's greatest heroes.

The group is studying background material provided by Iowa State University in Ames to prepare for their trip. Orrick Hanes, a former U.S. Ambassador to Algeria, will call Olson Monday to give him an additional briefing about the country.

Another story about Elkader by another editor of the Clayton County Register spurred the sister city relationship.

In 1979, the U.S. Information Agency asked Donna Menken, the Register's current editor, to write a freelance piece about Elkader for *Al Majal*, an Arabic language magazine the agency distributes in North Africa. Benaoumer Zergaoui, a 27-year-old Algerian office worker at the U.S. Embassy in Algeria, read Menken's story and grew interested in the Iowa city named after one of his country's more famous figures.

Zergaoui, who works as an information assistant for the embassy's U.S. Information Service, visited Elkader last summer during a training trip to the United States. The community's friendliness apparently moved Zergaoui, and he initiated the bond between Elkader and Mascara through Sister Cities International, Olson said.

The visit by the nine Elkader residents will complete the sister city agreement, Menken said. Although the Algerian government will pay for the entire trip, Menken said the group will travel as goodwill ambassadors for the United States.

"We are ambassadors and we have to know the rules," she said. "It's quite an honor for us and quite a responsibility at the same time. It's going to be interesting."

Included in the entourage are Olson and his wife, Ruth; Menken; City Council members Robert Grau and John Miller and their wives, Ruth and Mariella; Harold Griffith, the retired publisher of the Clayton County Register, and his wife, Louise, and Robert Buckner, Elkader school superintendent.

Although Elkader's emissaries have yet to receive the full itinerary of their trip, Olson and Menken said they expect to spend seven to 10 days in Algeria, beginning in the capital of Algiers and then traveling to Mas-

cara, a city of 100,000, about 60 miles south-east of the Algerian coast city of Oran.

Future relations between the two cities may include cultural exchanges and festivals sponsored by the sister cities, Olson said.

But Elkader will not be required to bring 10 Mascara officials to Iowa, which may be fortunate for the small community.

"We're limited in what we can do," Olson said. ●

TRIBUTE TO RAY DUCH

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise before this distinguished body today to pay tribute to Ray Duch on his retirement as superintendent of the Bay City public schools, and to honor his more than 30 years of service to our schools and our community.

Born in Pennsylvania, Ray came to the Bay City schools in 1953, after serving his country in the U.S. Navy in the Pacific during World War II, and study at Central Michigan University, where he received his B.S. in 1950, an M.A. in 1961, and a specialist in education degree in 1966. Before coming to Bay City, he had served as a teacher, coach, and transportation director for the Davison public schools.

He began his service in Bay City as a teacher and coach at MacGregor, then as principal at Dolsen Elementary, and has served Central High School as teacher, coach, and director of trade and industry, leaving his mark on many productive lives. In addition to his service to the Bay City schools, he has enriched the life of our community as an instructor in the Government manpower classes and at Bay City Junior College.

A period of progress, innovation, and educational excellence began as Ray was named superintendent of schools in January 1979. Within 3 months of taking office, he led the Bay City schools to the first millage victory after seven consecutive defeats, and went on to win the first 3-year, and the first 5-year millage increases in Bay City history. In the 1978-79 school year, the Bay City system had lost its North-Central and University of Michigan accreditation, and schools operated on a split schedule. Today, the Bay City schools are again on a normal schoolday, and are now on the threshold of University of Michigan accreditation. Other innovations include sixth class offerings in high schools, an improved counseling program, a full athletic and extra-curricular program, development of a planning model, increased library staff, and moving the administration building.

Ray Duch's service to Bay City has not been limited to the school system.

He has been a ranger in the Bay City State Park, and his activities in the Rotary Club, the PTA Council, St. Joseph's Church, and the Friends of Polish Culture have all worked to enrich life in Bay City. I know that retirement will not stop his dedication to the life of our community.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Ray for a lifetime of commitment to Bay City, and wish him, his wife, Lucille, and three children, the very best in his retirement. Knowing Ray, it is certain to be an active, productive, and giving one. ●

EAGLE SCOUTS HONORED

HON. TOM LEWIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the highest honor a Boy Scout can earn is that of Eagle Scout. Many great men in our history achieved that honor, but many more who tried cannot list it among their accomplishments.

It takes hours and hours of hard work, dedication and an abiding faith in the Scout code of honor to attain the status of Eagle Scout. The lessons an Eagle Scout learns during his long and tedious ascension to that honor can be used throughout life.

I am honored and proud to announce here that four fine young men from Florida's 12th Congressional District recently received Scouting's highest award during separate Eagle Court of Honor ceremonies.

Robert F. Hunter of Port Salerno, John Weldon Park of Lake Park, Scott Robertson of Jupiter, and Scott Schaag of Palm Beach Gardens are now Eagle Scouts and will always be the proud bearers of this uncommon and meritorious distinction. ●

FEDERAL BUDGET DEFICIT LEVEL

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have expressed a deep concern in the 98th Congress for the current level of our Federal budget deficit. However, when many of these Members have been given the option to take some concrete action to reduce the deficit, far fewer are willing to step forward and be counted in preventing budget increases. I was a sad, firsthand witness to this fact when I attempted to offer an amendment today in an effort to reduce deficit spending.

The measure considered by the House today, H.R. 2878, called for Federal funds to be allocated for the construction of public libraries in fiscal years 1984 through 1988. Because it is considered a local responsibility, such funds have not been allocated for this purpose since 1972. For that reason, and knowing that any effort to prevent increased Federal spending would be appreciated by the American people, I tried to cut funds for title II of H.R. 2878, which covered library construction.

Unfortunately, time did not permit me the opportunity to draft an amendment before consideration of title II. The magnitude of the budget deficit, however, and the expressed concern by so many of the Members of both political persuasions led me to believe that my colleagues would allow me to offer the amendment after the consideration of title II was completed. My assumption was wrong, as the gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. SIMON) objected to my offering the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that all the Members of this House who proclaim their concern for the expanding Federal budget deficit will begin to back up their talk in the 98th Congress with substantial action, and reduce unnecessary increases in Federal spending whenever possible.

At this time I would like to include my amendment offered earlier today, for the review of my colleagues.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2878, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. GEKAS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 5, strike out lines 3 through 5 and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly, and beginning on page 12, line 16, strike out all of section 12 through page 14, line 6, and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

Page 2, line 14, insert "and" after the semicolon, strike out lines 15 through 17, and redesignate the succeeding paragraph accordingly.●

ENGLISH INTRODUCES BILL TO
PROTECT AGRICULTURAL
BORROWERS

HON. GLENN ENGLISH

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation calling upon Federal regulatory agencies to exercise caution and restraint in their examinations of banks issuing loans to agricultural borrowers.

During recent years, our Nation's farming sector suffered historic financial losses and hardships. In 1983 farmers faced increased production costs coupled with reduced commodity prices, droughts, and declining international markets. 1982 and 1981 were not much better. Farming is a risky business but during recent years farm-

ers have had to play with only half a deck through no fault of their own. The hard times forced marginal farmers out of business. Unfortunately, poor market conditions continue and now threaten long-time farming establishments with temporary cash flow shortages. These are not weekend-hobby farmers. These are longstanding producers who represent the backbone of American agriculture.

Temporary cash flow shortages could result in unprecedented numbers of farm foreclosures, unless Federal bank examiners exercise prudence in their examinations and look beyond immediate repayment ability. This bill urges these examiners to exercise discretion for the purpose of seeing farmers through these temporary bad times. This bill urges examiners to consider additional factors besides immediate cash flow in determining ultimate loan repayment ability.

On behalf of the Oklahoma delegation, I introduce this measure with the hope of preventing Federal bank examiners from foreclosing on American agriculture.

The text of this measure follows:

Expressing the sense of Congress that Federal bank regulatory agencies should require their examiners to exercise caution and restraint in adversely classifying loans made to farmers and ranchers.

Whereas high production costs, severe drought, and low commodity prices have combined to reduce farm income to the lowest levels since the depths of the Depression in the 1930's, to subject many agricultural producers, through no fault of their own, to severe economic hardship, and in many cases temporarily but seriously to impair producers' ability to meet loan repayment schedules in a timely fashion; and

Whereas a policy of adverse classification of agricultural loans by bank examiners under these circumstances will trigger a wave of foreclosures and similar actions on the part of banks, thereby depressing land values and prices for agricultural facilities and equipment and having a devastating effect upon farmers and the banking industry, and upon rural America in general: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Federal bank regulatory agencies are requested and urged to ensure, in their examination procedures, that examiners exercise caution and restraint and give due consideration not only to the current cash flow of agricultural borrowers under financial stress, but to factors such as their loan collateral and ultimate ability to repay as well, for so long as the adverse economic effects of the cost-price squeeze of recent years and the drought of 1983 continues temporarily to impair the ability of these borrowers to meet scheduled repayments on their loans.●

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE ACT

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the creation of a State Justice Institute to aid State and local governments in strengthening and improving their judicial systems. As the National Institute of Corrections now provides assistance to State and local correctional facilities, so would the State Justice Institute assist the improvement of State court systems.

The responsibility of protecting the rights of all citizens under the Constitution is shared by State and Federal courts. Creation of a State Justice Institute would assist State courts in meeting their increasing obligations under both State and Federal law by providing funds for necessary technical assistance, education research and training. This will encourage the modernization of State court systems with respect to efficient management of caseloads, budgeting, and development of reliable statistical data. Establishment of a State Justice Institute would place responsibility for improvement of State court systems directly on the judicial officials charged with this responsibility under their own constitutions and laws, thus respecting the principles of separation of powers and federalism.

It is important for us to remove the competition between State judiciaries and State executive agencies for Federal assistance. A national program of assistance specifically for the improvement of State courts will create a beneficial environment for the administration of State court systems. In addition, a State Justice Institute would fill a current void by representing State courts in future national policy decisions that will affect the Nation's total justice system.

Legislation to create a State Justice Institute, H.R. 4145, is pending in the House Judiciary Committee. I look forward to the favorable consideration of this measure at the committee level and on the House floor.●

JOHN AYERS MERRITT, TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL COACH

HON. WILLIAM HILL BONER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1984

● Mr. BONER of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, John Ayers Merritt, the legendary Tennessee State University football coach who died December 15,

not only loved athletics, but also people and his community.

John Merritt instilled hope and confidence among all with whom he came into contact, but particularly among the young men and women he coached. His coaching style, outlook, dedication—in fact, Coach Merritt's full life story was a source of inspiration for young people both on and off the playing field.

Born in 1926 in Falmouth, Ky., John Merritt literally had nowhere to go when he completed elementary school. In 1937, there were no local high schools for blacks. But young Merritt was determined to further his education. He moved to live with an aunt in Louisville and worked hauling garbage while finishing his high school education at Central High School. During high school, he first learned the game of football. This was the beginning of an association that was to last more than 45 years.

After attending Kentucky State University on a football scholarship, Coach Merritt began his coaching career at the high school level while

working on a master's degree in physical education. In 30 years of college coaching, Coach Merritt compiled a won-lost record of 233-67-11. That winning percentage of 77.5 percent is the highest in the history of the sport. His 233-win total is the third highest in college football, behind only the late Alabama coach Paul "Bear" Bryant (323) and Grambling University's current coach Eddie Robinson (313).

During 10 years at Jackson State in Mississippi, Coach Merritt's team ran up a record of 68-28-3 and he was named Black College Football Coach of the Year in 1962. Merritt arrived at Tennessee State University in 1963 and over the next 20 years coached his teams to a phenomenal 173-34-6 record. TSU never had a losing season. His teams turned in four undefeated seasons, won six national championships, and sent over 100 players to the professional ranks.

These fine statistics, however, only tell half of Coach Merritt's story. Coach Merritt was also greatly concerned about the future of his players,

both on and off the field. His leadership and coaching style instilled hope and confidence among his players. Coach Merritt said:

Football gives a lot of black people hope. They want to win and be successful, so when we do win, it gives them lots of pride. That's important.

In a 1979 interview, Coach Merritt, who had at one time considered the ministry, said he supposed he had saved as many souls through coaching as he could have saved from the pulpit.

Merritt said:

I've seen kids come in here with absolutely nothing and leave with a bright future. That's the accomplishment I'm most proud of—not a bunch of numbers on some won-lost record.

Indeed, these players are Coach Merritt's living legacy. They are the legacy of a man whose love and concern for his community outweighed all else—a man who unselfishly shared his time and effort to all who asked.

John Ayers Merritt will be missed by all those here in Nashville whose life he touched. ●